

THE ANDOVER REVIEW

VOLUME XI.—PUBLISHED MONTHLY.—NUMBER LXII.

FEBRUARY, 1889

CONTENTS

	PAGE
THE TRAGIC MOTIF IN BROWNING'S DRAMAS. <i>Professor Charles Carroll Everett</i>	113
THE PROBLEM OF THE SECOND SERVICE ON SUNDAY. <i>Alexander McKenzie, D. D.</i>	132
THE EVOLUTION OF THE RELATION BETWEEN CAPITAL AND LABOR. <i>Mr. Adam Shortt</i>	144
THE INTELLECTUAL LIFE OF AMERICA. A SUPPLEMENT. <i>Henry S. Pan-coast, Esq.</i>	161
PROFESSOR SHEDD'S "DOGMATIC THEOLOGY." <i>Professor Harris</i>	168
EDITORIAL.	
The Preservation of Spiritual Christianity	180
A Roman Catholic Journal on the School Question	184
The Salaries of Ministers	186
A Communication on "The Problem of the Country Church "	190
7. ARCHÆOLOGICAL NOTES. <i>Professor Taylor</i>	193
8. SOCIAL ECONOMICS.	
I. The Outline of an Elective Course of Study. <i>Professor Tucker</i>	203
II. Sociological Notes. <i>Mr. D. Collin Wells</i>	207
9. BOOK REVIEWS AND NOTICES.	
Hale's How they lived in Hampton	211
Fiske's The Critical Period of American History, 1783-1789	212
Bennett's Christian Archæology	215
Hülster's Die Christliche Glaubenslehre vom Standpunkt des Methodismus	217
10. NOTES FROM ENGLAND. <i>Mr. Joseph King, Jr., M. A.</i>	220
11. BOOKS RECEIVED	223

BOSTON

HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN AND COMPANY

NEW YORK: 11 EAST SEVENTEENTH STREET

The Riverside Press, Cambridge

LONDON: WARD, LOCK & CO., WARWICK HOUSE, SALISBURY SQUARE

Entered at the Post Office at Boston as second-class matter

TERMS—SINGLE NUMBERS, 35 CENTS

YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, \$4.00

D²²² Public Library 89-2

REMINGTON

OVER

35,000



IN DAILY
USE.

STANDARD TYPEWRITER

WYCKOFF, SEAMANS & BENEDICT,
327 BROADWAY, NEW YORK.

A Harmony of the Four Gospels, in English.

According to the Common Version. By EDWARD ROBINSON, D. D. Revised Edition, with Footnotes from the Revised Version of 1881, and Additional Notes, by Prof. M. B. RIDDLE, D. D., recently of the Hartford Theological Seminary. 8vo, \$1.50, *net*.

Dr. Robinson's English Harmony, which was long the standard work of its class, has been revised so as to include the results of the very fruitful studies of the Gospels in recent years. *It is of the greatest value to Clergymen, Sunday School Teachers, and all Students of the Gospels.*

The Congregationalist, in reviewing this work, remarked: "To the majority of the lay members of our Congregational churches it is an invaluable help if they can have readily at hand such aid to the comprehension of our Saviour's life, and such light upon the real intent of many of his utterances, as are best obtained from the close comparison of the statements in their true chronological order—from their different angles of observation—of two or more of the evangelists. Forty years ago Dr. Edward Robinson published such a Harmony. . . . Now the volume has been taken in hand by Dr. M. B. Riddle, and on the basis of the old a new edition has been prepared which bears—we may literally say in every line—the marks of close and conscientious, as well as accurate, supervision. . . . When one considers the price of this really superb 8vo volume of 225 pages, it seems as if at least every Sabbath School teacher in the land ought to have it."

The New York Evangelist says: "Dr. Edward Robinson's Harmony of the Four Gospels has long been a standard work. . . . The footnotes, which constitute a new feature, are selected from the New Version. The Appendix is that of the Revised Greek Harmony. Dr. Riddle has here made many and valuable additions, all distinguished within brackets. Thus this new volume is, all in all, as nearly perfect as may be, and we are sure that it will be received with special favor by all students of the sacred Word."

* * For sale by all Booksellers. Sent by mail, post-paid, on receipt of price by the Publishers,

HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN & CO., BOSTON, MASS.

W

LY

R

K.

tion,

M.

met.

ass,

s in

and

em-

and

any

heir

the

Now

new

s of

price

hood

pels

ected

ddle

new

with

THE
ANDOVER REVIEW:

A RELIGIOUS AND THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.

VOL. XI. — FEBRUARY, 1889. — No. LXII.

THE TRAGIC MOTIF IN BROWNING'S DRAMAS.

MANY of the characters in the plays of Robert Browning have a strength and a sturdiness that remind us of the heroes of the Elizabethan stage. Yet we cannot read a page, we can hardly read a line, without recognizing the fact that we have here something very unlike the dramas of Shakespeare and of his English contemporaries. I am not here making a comparison between the genius of Browning and that of Shakespeare or any other poet of his time. I am considering merely the quality and fibre of his plays. They differ from those which the age of Elizabeth produced as our age differs from that of Elizabeth. To some this difference will seem to involve a loss; by others it will be held to be a gain; all that concerns us here is to ask wherein the difference consists.

If the question suggested by the title of this paper has any pertinence, it indicates one aspect of this difference. The question is as to the tragic *motif* in Browning's dramas. I think it would not occur to us to ask such a question in regard to the plays of Shakespeare, or, indeed, in regard to those of any of the dramatists of his day.

Shakespeare seems simply to have taken a story and brooded over it, till its characters became real to him. Other characters joined themselves to these, until at last the whole scene and the varied life that peopled it stood as if in actual presence before him, as he had the power to make them stand in real presence before us. We may make abstractions of his plays; we may make formulas of them; may idealize them, and show how the collisions

in them represent certain universal elements of human life. This sort of study may at first interest us. It may seem to throw new light upon the work. Soon, however, the process becomes monotonous and wearisome. The difficulty is that we are doing something that is foreign to the spirit of the plays. We are reaching results which were not at all in the mind of their author, and for which he would have cared little. Nothing would seem to have been further from the thought of Shakespeare than even to teach a moral lesson. We may draw moral lessons from his dramas if we will, but this is our doing, not his.

Shall we say, then, that for all the inspiration that comes to us from the plays of Shakespeare we owe no debt to the author? Since his characters were not his puppets to exhibit any notion of his own, shall we say that he was indifferent to them? Because the noble and the base meet in his dramas as they meet in the world, where the rain falls upon the evil and the good, and the sun shines upon the just and upon the unjust, — because the fool and the villain are drawn as carefully as the most heroic soul, and the best and the purest meet such suffering as in our world, if we were making one, we should reserve for the wicked alone — because of all this, shall we say that Shakespeare was indifferent to good and evil, to nobility and baseness? The nobility of Shakespeare is manifested in the fact that he is able to paint such nobility in his heroes. The lesson of the play comes not from the fact that goodness meets with its reward, but from the fact that we are made to see that the true soul, even in its most extreme sorrow, stands far above the mean soul, whatever may be its triumphs. The suffering of the true shows itself infinitely more attractive than the happiness of the false.

The plays of Browning, on the other hand, would seem to be each, in some sense, the embodiment of an idea, or at least of an ideal. In the presentation of this the characters are the instruments. However independent each may seem to be, he is a partial representative of the idea which embodies itself in the play. He is not merely the actor who is helping to bring about the predestined issue of the plot; his very nature has an ideal substance. The portions or elements of the general thought separate themselves from one another, stand over against one another, become embodied in living men and women, and develop the idea of the writer in objective reality before us. The writer, we may say, smites his idea and breaks it into its fragments, and like the broken geöde, it displays the beauty of its content. Yet

better may we compare such a work to the development of a plant, in which each leaf and stem seems to be pushing out its growth simply according to the impulse of its own nature; but all these separate growths are shaped and controlled by the ideal which lives in the plant, so that each has no being in itself but simply lives as a part of the great whole, by which its place and form are determined.

A drama of the kind that has just been described is obviously liable to many faults. It may be abstract and unreal. The characters may be so thoroughly the representatives of the author's thought that they may have no real life of their own. They may be like the personages in an allegory. But on the other hand the realistic drama has its perils. It may be rude and crude. It may lack unity. It may represent aspects of life which because they are so truly drawn may be untrue, just as in a painting an object that should stand in the background may be so accurately and distinctly portrayed that its relation to the rest of the picture is disturbed, and the result may be false. Shakespeare does not wholly escape the faults that beset the kind of composition to which his works belong. The French critics were to a large extent right in the indictment which they brought against Shakespeare's plays. They were wrong in not seeing that these faults belong largely to the kind of work which these plays represent; and, above all, in not perceiving that these faults are as nothing in comparison with the magnificence of the genius which even these faults themselves sometimes illustrate. That Browning wholly escapes the perils of his special kind of dramatic composition, it would be idle to deny. Here, too, the strength of the genius which created the plays reduces these faults, for the most part, to insignificance, and even makes them at times helpers in the grand impression which the play produces.

One fault that we might expect to be prominent in plays constructed upon an ideal basis is that of abstractness. From this the plays of Browning are, for the most part, free. The idea which they embody is nothing abstract. It is not a matter of the intellect alone. If it is ever separated from the form in which it is embodied, this can only be done artificially and violently, just as we may put into an abstract form any lesson which we have learned from the experience of life.

Another fault to which the plays of Browning might seem to be, from their nature, especially exposed, is the making some character of the play in a special manner the mouthpiece of the

author. This would strike at the truth and reality of the works. Thus the "Nathan the Wise" of Lessing, and the "Don Carlos" of Schiller, suffer, so far as dramatic strength is concerned, from the fact that the hero of the play in the one case, and the Marquis of Posa in the other, is the spokesman of the author. The former of these works may gain a new interest and importance thereby, but it loses in purely dramatic worth. The dramatic character must have a life and speech of his own, and owes no allegiance even to the power that created him. So far as I remember, Browning never thus appears by proxy upon his own stage. If his plays are to be called in any sense subjective, it is not in this sense. His heroes are veritable *creations* in that each has a being and a personality of his own. At the same time it must be admitted that the plays of Browning do not represent the reality of the world in the sense that most of the plays of Shakespeare represent it. It makes little difference whether the place where the scene is laid is called Florence or Juliers. It is as truly Browning's land as the island of Prospero is Shakespeare's land. The characters of Browning's plays would, many of them, be as little at home in the real Florence or the real Juliers, as Ariel and Caliban would be in the same regions. Yet who in reading the "Tempest" has any sense of unreality. The soil of the island is as solid beneath our feet as though it rested on the rocky framework of the earth. We have the same sense of reality in Browning's land that we have in Shakespeare's land. Moreover the inhabitants of this country are not creations of the fancy like Ariel. They are creations of the imagination. They are real men and women, in spite of their essential unreality. Though they represent originally only certain aspects of the author's idea, they yet have the air of completeness, and we give our interest to them, not chiefly on account of their ideal nature, but on account of their human reality. What, for instance, could be further removed from possible reality than the "Luria" and the "Colombe's Birthday"? Yet where do we have more truly the sense of reality, where do we yield ourselves more thoroughly to the interest in the persons and events which are placed before us than in these plays? In this we see the wonderful power of the poet. We yield ourselves so wholly to his spell that we accept without question whatever he may conjure up in our presence.

I have said that Browning does not wholly escape the perils to which the style of his dramatic art exposes him. In spite of the general independence and life of his characters, they now and then

become strained and unnatural. Speech and action are now and then artificial and jerky, so that we are for the moment awakened from an illusion, and become aware that what we see is not life, but the result of a cord that is pulled behind the scenes. This effect is, however, only occasional and transient; so that, on the whole, the air of reality of which I have spoken is preserved.

Since the plays of Browning have, for the most part, an ideal background and basis, they may properly be approached from the ideal side. Instead of studying, merely, persons and events, we may ask what it is that the author is telling us through these. We may look beyond the concrete tragic collision of the play, and ask what is the nature of that more fundamental collision that is illustrated in them. This central principle is more obvious in some plays than in others. The reader of "Paracelsus," for example, and "Pippa Passes," must needs be blind who should not discern that the writer had a meaning beyond the merely personal interest of the working out of the plot. In some it is less marked, yet I doubt if from any it is wholly absent.

One caution is of great importance in the study of Browning's plays. It is that so far as they have an ideal content this is always directly represented. They have no hidden meaning. It is a mistake to treat any one of these works as an allegory. We might as well turn the plays of Shakespeare into allegories. There is no poet to whom any indirect method is more foreign than it is to Browning. If he is maintaining a proposition in any poem he states it and defends it. If he is presenting any truth of life in a drama, the characters and the plot together simply and directly exemplify this. His works are to be interpreted by analysis only, an analysis which gives us simply what they contain. To look beyond them to anything foreign which they can be made to signify, is to miss absolutely the meaning that we would find.

I emphasize this because it refers to a method of criticism from which the poems of Browning have suffered greatly. They are to be read as poetry, and to be enjoyed, if they are enjoyed at all, as poetry. My introduction may, perhaps, raise a suspicion that my purpose is to add another to the attempts to sublimate these poems into philosophical abstractions. I trust that my results will prove this suspicion to be false.

I have spoken of the tragic *motif* in Browning's plays. Analysis alone can show how far this expression is correct, how far, that is, they embody, or tend to embody, one form of the tragic collision manifesting itself under many aspects. It is obvious that

we should expect that dramas having an ideal content should be narrower in their range than those which take their plots as they are offered by outward chance or by the caprice of fancy. If the interest of the author draws him towards a certain class of themes, the plays would manifest this tendency. This would suggest the regions where the circle is to be constructed within which his heroes are to move. It may be added that an author might be himself largely unconscious of this tendency. Each time the subject of the play might attract him by a fresh and independent interest; and he might never notice that all form a group which is gathered about a common central principle. Further, this common relation might not imply any sameness or repetition. The aspects under which the common principle manifests itself may be widely different from one another.

In looking more directly at the plays of Browning we are first struck by the fact that their interest is largely psychological. This, obviously, does not strictly distinguish them from the Elizabethan drama: In "Hamlet" and "Macbeth," also, the interest is largely of the same kind. It is a matter of emphasis and generality alone. No one, I think, however, would dispute the statement that in the plays of Browning this psychological aspect is more marked than in those of Shakespeare and his contemporaries.

Examining them more closely still, we find a certain form of psychological interest that is more marked than any other. There would seem to have hovered before the mind of Browning the ideal of a nature in which all the elements are in a due relation of supremacy and subordination. This ideal, however, he finds nowhere fulfilled. He cannot himself give to it a concrete form. He finds natures only partially developed, natures at war with themselves or with one another. The fragments of this perfect spiritual ideal are sometimes embodied in different personalities. Sometimes they exist over against one another, unharmonized in the same personality; sometimes a personality is seen in its weakness and imperfection because only a part of its nature has free play. (In particular the elements most often thus contrasted and at war are the head and the heart; and in this unsolved discord between the head and the heart I find the leading *motif* in the dramas of Browning.)

To make my meaning clear, I have spoken as if this were the result of a conscious aim on the part of the writer. If there is any truth in the characterization of the plays that I have given,

the results are equally interesting whether consciously or unconsciously produced. In any case, the relation would imply no cold and abstract method of composition. The fact that the head and the heart form the fundamental elements in human life, that the perfection of human life is found when these work in perfect harmony; that they are for the most part in discord; and that out of this discord spring so many of the failures and so much of the unrest of life; and the search for some method by which these may be brought into accord, so that life may reach the grand fullness of the harmony which belongs to it: all this may indeed be intellectually stated. It is also obvious that it all may be made a matter of vision instead of mere intellectual discussion. In fact the reality and the vision are the primary things; the intellectual statement is an afterthought. The professor of music may lecture learnedly upon discord and harmonies, but none the less is a jangle of sounds that by degrees works itself clear of its discords and rises into the gladness of a triumphant harmony, a real and concrete fact. It is the discords and the harmony that are the reality of which the statement of the lecturer was the abstraction. Thus it is that, though in discussing the plays of Browning we may abstract the ideal element that they embody, and put it into an intellectual form, yet the plays themselves set before us the reality which this discussion presupposes.

Before looking at the dramas themselves it is important to notice the recurrence of the same theme in some of the more important of the poems that are not dramas, which were produced during or near the time at which these were written. We may let the "*Dramatis Personæ*" conclude the period of literary creation that concerns us.

The earliest poem published by Browning is entitled "*Pauline; a Fragment of a Confession.*" This bears the date of 1833. The poet was twenty-one years old at the time of its composition. The author tells us that he acknowledges and retains it among his works with extreme repugnance, simply to forestall imperfect transcripts. The poem is indeed faulty. It is fortunate, however, that it is not in the author's power to suppress it; for with all its faults it contains many and great beauties. It further forms an exceedingly interesting introduction to his poems, as, in however extravagant a manner, it presents that discord which his more finished works illustrate so often. The poem is the confession of a mind disordered and at war with itself. It presents a spirit which, in spite of the magnificence in which its utterances

are sometimes clothed, is weak and repulsive. Selfish, passionate, and without the guidance of a firm will and a fixed purpose, it yet represents a certain development, and passes through phases of experience which are interesting, if at times unpleasant, to behold. The hero, like Goethe's Faust, longed to bring into his own experience the experiences of the world. He felt himself to be a hero at whose feet the world lay. There was nothing too high or vast for him. Imagination opened its realms to him. He was

"A god
Wandering after beauty, or a giant
Standing vast in the sunset — an old hunter
Talking with gods, or a high crested chief
Sailing with troops of friends to Tenedos."

In seeking to compass all the goods of the world, he fell into sin. He felt

"A yearning after God,"

which was reconciled, as he tells us, —

"With a neglect of all I deemed his laws
Which yet, when seen in others I abhorred."

As life developed he found that he could not compass these vast plans. Disappointment and weariness dogged his steps. He cries : —

"But my soul saddens when it looks beyond.
I cannot be immortal — nor taste all.
O God, where does this tend — these struggling aims."

The difficulty, as he in one place expresses it, is that here while the heart is limited, reason is boundless : —

"And thus I know this earth is not my sphere,
For I cannot so narrow me but that
I still exceed it : In their elements
My love would pass my reason ; but since here
Love must receive its objects from this earth
While reason will be chainless ; the few truths
Caught from its wanderings have sufficed to quell
All love below ; then what must be that love
Which, with the object it demands, would quell
Reason tho' it soared with the seraphim ?"

There would seem thus to be a hopeless discord between the head and the heart. Here, the infinite range of thought leaves the heart powerless to attain satisfaction ; while in the higher life love would be so mighty that reason would be set at naught. The heart is indeed unable to offer fitting love to the highest which

reason actually presents, or to trust itself to this. After a beautiful picture of the Christ, the hero of the poem exclaims: —

“A mortal, sin's familiar friend, doth here
Avow that he will give all earth's reward
But to believe and humbly teach the faith,
In suffering and poverty and shame,
Only believing he is not unloved.”

Thus hopeless seems the strife between these two fundamental elements of the nature. Yet there comes into this discord at least a temporary peace. In the presence of Pauline, to whom the confession is addressed, this perturbed spirit is at rest. He loves her with a passionate tenderness. At the same time, he reverences her so that he is ready to yield himself to her guidance. In this affection where the head and the heart are alike satisfied, the solution of the strife is found. This solution is temporary, for he sometimes speaks as if, when he has left her, he should fall back into the mire of his old life. Sometimes he speaks of going with her to her Swiss mountain home, where by this companionship and by the companionship, also, of the mountains, his spirit may be brought into an enduring harmony, and he may return strengthened for a more earnest life. However this may be, the reconciliation of himself with himself is real so long as he feels the power of her presence, and he can exclaim to her: —

“Be still to me
A key to music's mystery when mind fails,
A reason, a solution, and a clew!”

The “Sordello” was written seven years later. In the earlier part of this poem we have very much the same theme that inspired the “Pauline,” only in the “Sordello” we have it more clearly wrought out, and we feel not so much the presence of a greater poet as of one who has attained to a better mastery of himself and of his material. Unhappily, this mastery is not yet quite complete. The difficulty which so many meet in reading the poem, a difficulty so great that it is a sealed book even to many students of Browning, shows that the workmanship was not yet perfect. I can but regard this obscurity as a great misfortune to many, for the poem contains some of Browning's strongest, most beautiful, and daintiest writing. So beautiful and dainty is it, that I shrink from the attempt to translate its inner life into the prose of an abstract statement.

Sordello is a character kindred in many respects to the unnamed hero of “Pauline.” He is stronger and purer and every way

more worthy of our sympathy; still his nature embodies the same inner contradiction which marred the life of his inferior prototype. Like him he felt himself to be as if a god upon the earth. The feeling takes in both cases the same phraseology. Sordello imagines himself as it were Apollo. All things seemed subject to him. At first he filled the beautiful nature in the midst of which he dwelt with his dreams of supremacy. Then he imagined a world of men and women among whom he still was supreme.

Suddenly the moment comes when he can change this vision of preëminence into a fact. At a season of public rejoicing he listens to the song of a famous troubadour who is delighting the gay company. As he listens, he sees how far short the minstrel has fallen of fulfilling the possibilities of his subject. As the singer ceases, Sordello springs into his place, takes up the theme which the other had presented, and gives it in such a form of perfect beauty that all are entranced. Palma, the lady whose betrothal the festivities celebrate, and to whom Sordello had already given his heart, chooses him as her minstrel. He accepts the position eagerly. It promises to fulfill the dream of the impossible. He, like the hero of the "Pauline," had longed to compass all the joys and the glories of life. As a poet he could do this. In his song he could take part in all the experiences of the world, and as he sang of its heroes their fame should become his.

In all this he was disappointed. As a poet he stood outside the joys he pictured. Moreover the fame which he was to win passed by him, and he learned that he was placing the crown upon the head of the hero of his song. He was the instrument of another's glory. Worse than all, the power of song failed him. In a moment of self-forgetfulness Sordello had given free play to all his genius; but this grand effort he could never repeat. The vastness of his ideal condemned his partial achievements. Self-criticism clipped the wings of his genius. He was divided with himself: —

"Weeks, months, years went by,
And lo, Sordello vanished utterly,
Sundered in twain, each spectral part at strife
With each; one jarred against another life;
The Poet thwarting hopelessly the Man."

Thus ends what we may call the first movement of the poem. Sordello returns to his old solitude and inactivity. In what we may call the second movement he became interested in the politi-

cal aspects of the time. He took sides with the party of the Guelphs, regarding these as representing the cause of the people. Suddenly it appeared that instead of being of lowly birth, as he had supposed, he was the son of one of the noble leaders of the imperial party. By taking the position to which he now appeared to belong, he could obtain whatever was dearest to him. He could wed Palma, and enjoy that life of luxury which his nature demanded. In accepting this, however, he must forsake the cause of the people which he had espoused. He was willing to make the sacrifice, if only he could be assured that it would accomplish any good. A fierce mental struggle ensued, which is portrayed by the poet in lines possessing that wonderful power of psychical analysis of which he is the master. The difficulty is similar to that which had checked Sordello's activity as Poet. There is the great contrast between the ideal and the actual, between eternity and time. The whole that he would accomplish mocked at the little that he could achieve. The vast range that was open to the intellect by its very infinitude left the heart nothing to cling to in the actual. Through such a mesh of intellectual difficulties he could not find a way; neither would he surrender what seemed to him, in spite of logical questioning, the right. The strife between the two parts of his nature proved a fatal one. He was found sitting dead, and under his foot lay the badge of the Ghibelline party.

Then follows what is the most tragical part of the story. Sordello died in the struggle to be true to what seemed to him the best; but it would have been better for his country if he had boldly taken the place to which he was born, and served her as he could. In no other work of Browning does the tragedy seem to me to be so real as this. In most of his other poems, in which a similar mental struggle has its place, the heart is seen to be the truest guide. Here we see the blindness of the heart in trying to fulfill its highest ideal.

The sum of the story is the picture of a life that at every turning, came to naught on account of the unsolved discord of the nature.

The only other poem that I will refer to in this connection is the "Christmas Eve." I trust that I may assume that this is too familiar to the reader to require a detailed analysis. If any one does not remember the quaint realism of the "Zion Chapel"; the glory of the night into which the hero of the poem steps; the appearance of the rainbow and of the Christ; the magnificence of the

worship in St. Peter's, which has never received such perfect picturing; and the scene in the lecture-room at Göttingen, which is as realistic in its way as is the scene in the "Zion Chapel," — any reader, I say, if there be any such, who does not recall all this, cannot do better than turn to his Browning, where an unwonted feast awaits him. It is sufficient for our present purpose to notice that the clearest and most fundamental contrast in the poem is that between the Christmas Eve at Rome and the Christmas Eve as it was passed in the lecture-room at Göttingen. In both the Christ was present, yet each was imperfect. The one was the worship of the heart. We are told distinctly that love and love alone was its animating principle. The other was the worship of the intellect. The heart and the intellect thus stand over against one another in an unsolved contradiction. The fact that the hero of the poem settles down at last upon the "Zion Chapel" as his spiritual home does not pretend to solve the difficulty. The choice appears to be arbitrary and without sufficient motive. We take from the poem as its clearest idea the separation of head and heart and the loss that comes to each from its isolation.

I have, perhaps, delayed too long with these poems, but the examination will make the study of the dramas themselves shorter and easier. The earliest of these is the "Paracelsus." This was written two years later than the "Pauline." It is a marvelous work to have been written by a youth of twenty-three; and yet I hesitate to use the expression, lest it should seem patronizing or belittling. I should not know where to look for a grander example of sublimity in poetry. For myself, I remember the day when in my youth I first read the "Paracelsus," as I remember the day in which I found myself face to face with the Jungfrau range in Switzerland. The poem has not merely the sublimity of the mountains; it has also beauties which may remind us of the flowers that nestle among the alpine rocks, and on the very edge of the glaciers.

The hero is Titanic, at once in his strength and in his impotence. He would scale the heavens by knowledge. He would only know. Love he would trample under foot. He is the half of a divided man. He is contrasted with Aprile, who would give himself to love and to the enthusiasm of beauty, as Paracelsus had given himself to knowledge. Aprile had failed as Paracelsus had failed. The heart could not live without the head any more than the head could live without the heart. Aprile dies, as it would appear, in the arms of Paracelsus. He knows not his

nature, but yet he feels by a secret instinct that Paracelsus is the master who might have helped him to solve the intricate problem of life. Paracelsus, on the other hand, recognizes Aprile and sees that in him was that complemental life which he had missed.

He cries : —

“ I too have sought to know as thou to love —
Excluding love as thou refusedst knowledge.
Still thou hast beauty, and I, power. We wake :
What penance canst devise for both of us ? ”

And again : —

“ Die not, Aprile we must never part.
Are we not halves of one dissevered world,
Whom this strange chance unites once more ? Part ? Never !
Till thou the lover, know ; and I the knower,
Love — until both are saved.”

It was, however, too late. Aprile died as we have seen, and Paracelsus was left alone in the waste which he had made his life. Near the close of the poem he recognizes more fully the mistake that he had made. He sees that such knowledge as he could at the best have attained is nothing, compared to the heights of knowledge which are unattainable. The glory of life he finds to consist in something very different from this : —

“ From God
Down to the lowest spirit ministrant,
Intelligence exists which casts our mind
Into immeasurable shade. No, no :
Love, hope, fear, faith — these make humanity ;
These are its sign and note and character.
And these I have lost ! — gone, shut from me forever,
Like a dead friend safe from unkindness more ! ”

Thus in his despair he despises the strength that had been really his, as he sees how empty it is of good when separated from the love which is the heart of life. We have here, though in a very different form, the same contrast and the same incompleteness which were exhibited in the “Christmas Eve,” in the antithesis between the passionate worship of the Church of Rome and the cold intellectual analysis of the German Professor.

The “Pauline,” as we have seen, is somewhat vague and formless. The “Paracelsus” owes, in part, its sublimity to a like formlessness. In the “Strafford” it would appear as if the poet had set himself to write a poem that should be confined within strictly human possibilities and interests ; while, as yet, his genius did not move quite freely within these limitations. In fact, we

have the least Browningsque of all Browning's dramas. It possesses beauty and strength, but these are not quite in Browning's ordinary manner. This play could hardly be called in any special sense a psychological study. Yet the discord in the nature of the hero, which is so common a theme with Browning, is not wholly absent here. The discordant elements in the nature of the speaker in Browning's earliest poem were harmonized by his love for Pauline. In the case of *Strafford* it is love that causes the discord. The king he loves and reverences, while he knows that he is unworthy of either love or reverence. In this inner collision is the real tragedy of the play. One of the characters exclaims:—

“ Prove the king faithless, and I take away
All *Strafford* cares to live for.”

The king was proved faithless, and it was this, added to his anxiety for the future of him whom he still loved while he despised him, that added the chief bitterness to the death of *Strafford*.

Leaving the strict chronological order, we will now compare the “*Pippa Passes*” and “*A Blot on the 'Scutcheon*.” The most obvious idea suggested by the “*Pippa Passes*” is the influence that one may unconsciously exert in the world. As *Pippa* says near the close of the play:—

“ Now one thing I should like to really know :
How near I ever might approach all these
I only fancied being, this long day :
Approach, I mean, so as to touch them, so
As to . . . in some way . . . move them, if you please.”

This she says, all unconscious that the fate of all had been determined by her. Deeper than this, however, is the nature of the influence that she has used. It was simply that of a simple, loving, believing heart. At the touch of her songs of childlike trust, as

“ God 's in his heaven —
All 's right with the world ! ”

the sophistries of sin and selfishness dissolve and vanish.

In “*A Blot on the 'Scutcheon*” we have again the simple heart of love, ignorant and untrained. In its simplicity it lost itself in the mazes of the world.

“ I — I was so young !
Beside, I loved him, *Thorold* — and I had
No mother ; God forgot me : so I fell.”

In its simplicity it knew no other way than to take the full measure of its guilt upon itself. It would not speak the one word of

truth that would open to it the door of a happy life. It refused to take the path which reason, which, as nine tenths at least of the men and women of the world would say, common sense would indicate. So it died defeated in the unequal struggle with the world, triumphant only in its own simple beauty. Thus, as in the "Pippa Passes," we have the heart unaided by the intellect triumphing over the sophistries and the wickedness of the world; in "A Blot on the 'Scutcheon" we have it left also to itself, but vanquished and slain.

"The Return of the Druses" and the "Luria" have not always received, so far as I have noticed, from students of Browning the full recognition that is their due. In them the intellect of the West and the warm heart of the East with its faiths and its instincts are brought into sharp contrast. Djabal, in "The Return of the Druses," attempted to make a cunning that he had borrowed from the West the instrument of his Oriental heart. Luria attempted to make the passion and the instincts of the heart subservient to the intellect of the West. Both failed. Thus Djabal exclaims:—

"I, with my Arab instinct, thwarted ever
By my Frank policy, — and, with, in turn,
My Frank brain, thwarted by my Arab heart —
While these remained in equipoise, I lived
— Nothing; had either been predominant,
As a Frank schemer or an Arab mystic,
I had been something; now, each has destroyed
The other — and behold, from out their crash,
A third and better nature rises up —
My mere man's-nature!"

In like manner Luria, after contrasting "feeling the East's gift" with Northern thought, and showing how he had tried to unite the two, utters his failure in the cry, —

"I born a Moor lived half a Florentine,
But, punished properly, can die a Moor."

In the "Colombe's Birthday" we have in a double form the contrast which has met us so often. The first is between Guibert the courtier, with his indirect methods, and Valence with the simple straightforwardness of his earnest heart. Guibert is ultimately won over by Valence and learns to trust his own heart. He exclaims:—

"I'm right sir — but your wrong is better still,
If I had time and skill to argue it."

Later in the play, in Berthold and Colombe, we have a like contrast. Berthold had selected Colombe, as all things considered, the most fitting person for him to wed. Such a marriage he believed would help on his political plans, and the lady herself was wholly worthy of his choice. He offers his hand to her in marriage. Colombe was hardly satisfied with an offer that seemed to have more of business than of love in it.

Colombe. You love me, then ?

Berthold. Your lineage I revere,
Honor your virtue, in your truth believe,
Do homage to your intellect, and bow
Before your peerless beauty.

Colombe. But, for love —

Berthold. A further love I do not understand."

We rejoice in the victory of love, when Colombe, with that wisdom that is foolishness to the world, chose the heart that would give itself to her, instead of the head that judged her worthy of its approbation.

The "King Victor and King Charles" presents two types of statesman, — King Victor, the wily diplomatist, using stratagem and deceit, and King Charles trusting only to straightforward honesty. Thus King Victor, after having surrendered the crown to his son, says, —

"You're now the king : you'll comprehend
Much that you may have wondered at — the shifts,
Dissimulation, wiliness I showed."

But Charles answered : —

"No : straight on shall I go,
Truth helping ; win with it or die with it."

Of "A Soul's Tragedy" I hardly know how to speak. We should be inclined to consider the cynicism and the blatant boasts of the hero in the earlier part of the play to be mere hypocrisy. The title, however, "A Soul's Tragedy," shows that his heart must have been true at first ; and, indeed, it is in a moment of unselfish enthusiasm that he takes upon himself the deed of his friend, who has killed the Provost in his quarrel. The later course of the hero must then represent a real fall, and in this consists the tragedy. These words of Eulalia would seem to express the inmost heart and significance of the work : —

"You cannot, will not, see
How, place you but in every circumstance
Of us, you are just now indignant at,
You'd be as we."

The circumstances were changed, and the boaster sank far below those whom he had scorned. We have thus contrasted the world of imagination and the world of real life. We see how strong and clear the intellectual ideal may be, while the heart, when it is tested, may show itself to be very weak.

I have thus with great self-restraint, hastening past beauties, among which I would gladly have lingered, surveyed the dramas of Browning. The passages that I have quoted, and the points that I have indicated, have no accidental or superficial relation to the plays from which they are severally taken. They represent what in each case would seem to be the inmost life and movement of the play. As a result of this examination we cannot fail to be struck with the prominence which the antithesis between feeling and the intellect has in them. This is the more striking when we recall the results of our examination of the "Pauline," the "Sordello," and the "Christmas Eve." Even if in regard to one or two of the plays it may be thought that this aspect is less obvious, the general effect remains.

At the beginning of this discussion reference was made to the ideal content of Browning's plays. Our examination shows us that this is nothing abstract or artificial. It is rather an ideal than an idea. The poet did not take an intellectual proposition and then create a play that should illustrate it. He took for his theme one of the most obvious facts in our modern life. As Shakespeare represented in his tragedies the struggles and collisions which had most obviously marked the times which he would picture on his stage, so Browning has shown himself pre-eminently the child and the poet of his century, by representing that inner struggle and discontent which are so marked an element in its life. It is the discontent of souls that find no object which seems worthy of their highest effort, and of a faith that feels the ground shaken beneath its feet. It is this discord between the head and the heart which has brought into the age that sad *ennui* and that deeper pain of which we hear so much. Other elements, indeed, manifest themselves. There are faith and courage and earnest endeavor such as every age has possessed; but it is perhaps this inner discord which especially belongs to it. This inner strife we sometimes are tempted to regard as a misfortune. Perhaps it is not. Perhaps Browning is right when, in one of his poems, he exclaims, —

"No, when the fight begins within himself,
A man's worth something."

It may now be asked what is the meaning of it all? What would the poet teach us by such diverse presentations? Do they not contradict one another, and are we not left precisely where we were before?

To such questions it may be replied that it is not the business of the dramatic poet to teach lessons. If he teaches us it is by the way. We may learn lessons from the drama as we learn them from life. The "Othello" of Shakespeare has a lesson for any one who will receive it, and so has any story of jealousy and crime which the newspaper or the court records may give us. In such a sense the dramas of Browning have a lesson for us. They make us see that if the heart and the brain are to part company, it is better to trust to the heart; that the fresh instincts of the nature are to be trusted above all things. At the same time they make us see that the highest in life is, or would be, a life in which the heart and the head are in accord, in which the man stands as a perfect whole, no part of the nature repressed, no part distrusted, but all uniting to manifest that absolute harmony which is the perfection of the spirit. It is much to show what is the ideal of life even if this ideal is not placed in living form before us. It is well that we should be made to feel the primacy of the heart even while we are made to see that the heart needs the alliance of the head, if life is to be complete.

Although in his dramas the problem is left for the most part unsolved, now and then in his other poems Browning gives a glimpse of the perfect relation in which heart and intellect are in accord; in which the intellect accepting the primacy of the heart uses its strength to fulfill its ideal and to justify its confidence. Thus the "Saul" arises among the poems that contain so many questionings and discords a great utterance of faith. In this poem, from the very fact of the intensity of human love the thought mounts full of faith to the contemplation of the divine love. This poem, so full of passion and of poetic beauty, has thus this special interest, that in it the discord which has met us so often is, under one of its aspects, solved.

A similar flight of thought, using the wings of love, was begun in the "Christmas Eve." There we read: —

"For a loving worm within its clod
Is diviner than a loveless God."

For some reason, however, the extremely beautiful portrayal of worship in and through Nature in which these lines occur appears

to have had little influence in shaping the result which the poem finally reached. The "Rabbi Ben Ezra" is a splendid example of a spirit that has reached a harmony with itself.

It is an interesting question whether the prominence, given in the dramas and the earlier poems to which I have referred, to the inharmonious relation of the head and the heart is in any respect the expression of the inner life of the poet. The question might be raised whether the ruggedness and harshness of much of the poetry had their source in some inner unrest which the collision that has been referred to so often might illustrate. To such questions I have no answer. The discord of the life without may furnish sufficient reason for the prominence that is given in the poems to the elements which we have considered. Still we cannot fail to notice the peculiar sweetness in the lines which Browning addressed to her who was his intellectual companion as well as the object of his love; and after seeing how the sense of the lack of harmony between the head and the heart dominates so much of the earlier poetry of Browning, it is with a special sense of repose that we hear him saying to her, —

"Here where the heart rests let the brain rest also."

In these words we may seem to find a hint of the fulfillment of the poet's earliest dream of love and beauty. What Pauline was to the passionate and discordant nature of the hero of Browning's first poem, that we may conjecture was to the stronger personality of the poet the object of his affection. He could not, so at least we may fancy, wholly escape the unrest of a questioning age, and he may have found in her, in whom the spiritual ideal was so perfectly embodied,

"A reason, a solution and a clue."

In this we may find a suggestion of the solution which Christianity presents to the discords of life. It offers truth manifested in a human form that can claim at once the allegiance of the intellect and of the heart, in relation with which, therefore, their strife may become reconciled. To this Browning more than once makes reference. He does not, indeed, use the formula in which I have just expressed the fact; but the fact itself is one to which he loves to turn. I will quote only the exclamation that he makes to Sordello, just at the crisis of that inner battle which was to prove fatal to him. The poet pauses in the story, and cries, it would appear, in his own voice and person: —

"Ah my Sordello, I this once befriended

And speak for you. Of a power above you still,

Which, utterly incomprehensible,
 Is out of rivalry, which thus you can
 Love, though unloving all conceived by man —
 What need ! and . . .
 . . . of a power its representative,
 Who, being of authority the same,
 Communication different, should claim
 A course, the first chose and this last revealed —
 This Human clear, as that Divine concealed —
 What utter need !”

Charles Carroll Everett.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

THE PROBLEM OF THE SECOND SERVICE ON SUNDAY.¹

THIS question is born and not made. It expresses a difficulty with which many churches and ministers are concerned. It arises from the changed conditions of society, and suggests the effort which seeks a readjustment of the methods of the church to the work which it is to do. Such adjustments have been made from time to time, and will be needed to the end. The points to be kept in view are the purpose of the services of the church, and the way most fully to accomplish this. The purpose is essentially one in all places; but methods must vary. The city and the village, the parish church and the mission church, need a proper adaptation of means to ends in each instance, according to the special circumstances in which the work is to be done. Something will be gained if we settle at the outset the result to be secured. The object of the church service, whether it be the first, or second, or third, is not to bring people together, that there may be a large assembly, nor is it merely or chiefly to entertain them when they are assembled. Nor is it to collect funds for the maintenance of worship. But it is to evangelize that part of the community which is intrusted to the church; to preach the gospel to every creature there, to make him a disciple of Christ, to train him in the truth and spirit of the gospel, to make him a witness and apostle. In this way the church is strengthened and enriched, yet it

¹ This article will be followed by “Comments” in the next number of the *REVIEW*. Contributions are specially invited from those who are seeking to recover or to extend the influence of the Second Service of the Sabbath. MSS. to be available for the March number of the *REVIEW* must be received by February 10th.

receives the gain, not for its own sake alone, but that it may more efficiently fulfill its mission.

There is no canonical rule for the ordering of our Sunday. We have inherited the New England custom of two services, and have added to these the Sunday-school, and in many instances one or more prayer-meetings. In some places this generous use of the day for public meetings may be desirable. It is the division of the day for different uses, in which different persons may be engaged. To require the same persons to be present at all hours would be an infringement upon the design of the Sabbath. But a distribution of force among the hours may be proper and efficient. The services will naturally differ in character while keeping to one end. The service of the forenoon is especially for those who are regular attendants at the church, with such visitors as may be attracted. If no other persons were to be considered, one service might be sufficient, while the rest of the day could be devoted to religious uses in the home. Many content themselves with the morning service. Whether the rest of the day is kept holy to the Lord, and household reading, worship, and intercourse employ the quiet hours, and make them "special times of special fellowship and sweetest mutual embracings," in which the risen Lord has the chief place, admits of doubt. That it might be so is certain. If, as Thomas Shepard said of those who, in primitive times, observed two Sabbaths in a week, "doubtless their milk sod over and their zeal went beyond the rule," surely they are needlessly austere with themselves and their households who do not observe one Sabbath in the week.

The need of two services of the old pattern has largely, perhaps entirely, disappeared. People are nearer together, and the occasions for other meetings of many kinds have increased. If any one adds that we have also more good reading than formerly, it may be replied that New England has never suffered for the lack of good books. The new are not altogether better than the old. Times have changed, and we must change with them. If it is settled that the morning is to remain as it is, we are confronted by the fact that large numbers of persons have had no religious service. Many of these are devout persons who are seldom able to be at church in the forenoon. It is often necessary that a part of a family remains at home while another part goes out. The second service should have regard to these, while they are not so numerous, in most cases, that their convenience should give form to the service. Their want can be met, probably, without this.

But there remain large numbers of persons who do not frequent any church, or who frequent all churches, and have an interest in none. These are to be distinctly recognized, and special provision is to be made for them. They should be constantly in mind, and to reach them should be recognized as a part, and a large part, of the reason why the church should be. The church should be felt in every house, and by every individual, within its domain. To every one its ministry should extend, in word and work, and, so far as it is possible, every person should be brought where the gospel is preached. They get the good of the church and its services who come to them with constancy, and find in them a part of their life. What we have come to call the second service may well have this pronounced missionary character and purpose. This is easily and frequently said; more frequently now than ever before. But the duty and opportunity are far from holding their place in the thought and plan of our church life. This is no pastime. The romance soon fades from it. It becomes hard, continuous, often disheartening work. Yet it remains our work, and it must be done. One half of the Lord's day may well be devoted to it.

There are two general classes who are not attendants at any church. There are persons of maturity, position, culture, who have separated themselves from the church and all which it distinctively represents. Many of these it would be very difficult, at least, to persuade to come to the sanctuary. Those who could be persuaded would be most attracted by the morning service. There is no doubt that many of these could be induced to come in with their neighbors, if the services were strong enough to repay them; if the church kept to its province and preachers were careful to say little where they know little, and bold and faithful where they have the warrant of truth. It is not without reason that a scholar of reverent spirit, himself an attendant, has complained that the shallow attacks on science and scientific men have sometimes made it hard to sit in church. The indiscretion of preachers has not confined itself to that domain. Sound learning, just argument, and a generous spirit might have held, might regain, some who have found in the church little which helped them to higher thought and better lives. Whether the service be the first or second, it should be dignified, truthful, helpful.

But the persons to whom the mind turns at once when we speak of those who are to be reached by the church are mostly different from these. They are intelligent and well-meaning, but not

scholarly in their taste, not fastidious, not much given to meditation and careful thought. Many of them are young, and have no homes. Their work holds them through the week. Sunday morning is appropriated by sleep and the newspaper, and the evening finds them at leisure and adrift. They float together, and are borne along the streets. They seek companions, and drift with them upon the current. We cannot repress our sympathy for those who are thus wandering abroad, to change our simile, like sheep having no shepherd. We wish they could be fed. We wish they would be fed. For them, with kind intent, the churches open their doors. Messengers go after them, and strive to bring them in. They come in. To-day they come into this house; next Sunday they will be drawn into another gate. They are reinforced by a large company of those of similar necessities and attainments who have homes and who stay in them till nightfall. They do not quite like the church; they think it haughty and exclusive; they fancy that neither their raiment nor their purse will permit them the luxury of sittings which they may call their own. To a great extent this is a delusion, but it is not quite baseless. Reasonable or not, it marks a condition which cannot be disregarded.

Without entering into further description, it is clear that there are great numbers of "other sheep" whom, in the Good Shepherd's name, we are to seek and to save. They are in all our cities and towns and villages. For their sake, and for our own sake, we must accept the charge which we have received and go after that which is lost. The second service may well be consecrated to this endeavor.

What shall we offer when we seek them and give them when they come? We know what we wish to accomplish. What shall be our method? We are to offer them and give them the gospel of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. That seems a commonplace answer. On the contrary, it is an answer of profound significance. The thought of the eager, anxious mind is of some device which may be presented, some new allurement, some fresh appeal to a restless curiosity. This desire has wrought untold harm to the church and its services, and made our work more difficult and less remunerative than it might have been. We shall be wise to come back to our simple work, to tell the story of Christ and his redemption in faith and love. "We must interest the people," is the cry. The gospel interests the people. It is in itself interesting, in its letter and its spirit. It wins men readily, and it holds

them when everything else fails. It lasts when the mind and heart grow weary of sights and sounds, of fine sentiments, and visionary theories. This is in the intent. The power of God and the wisdom of God are in it. It is inspired in the writing and the preaching. It finds men and saves them. We are not sent to baptize, but to preach the gospel.

It is a pleasing fancy, but still a fancy and a fiction, that we must attract the people, and that any means are expedient which will do this, because when we have enticed them within the door we can, without their suspecting it, hurriedly inject into their lives enough truth to save them. The design is deceptive. It makes a great difference in what mood, and for what purpose, the people come to church. If it is for entertainment, it is entertainment at which they grasp, in singing and sermon. Their ears, their minds, are prepared for this, and the most serious appeal is transformed into entertainment. The soil has much to do with the crop. It had in Galilee when the Master taught. He found it necessary to bid men take heed how they hear.

We are not dealing with fools. Those whom we would attract may not be very critical or very bright. They are bright enough to see through the guile which would allure them with a trumpet that it may worry them with a sermon. They see through it and outwit it. Nor is there need of these devices. It is best to be fair with men. No book approaches the Bible in interest, and the common people will hear it gladly and feel its power. This is the reliance of the best preachers the world over. Some are eminent, some are ordinary, but they are wise who depend upon the Word. It is an evil hour when a church dilutes the truth to make it pleasant, or dresses it in strange garb to make it enticing. St. Paul sometimes gave meat, and sometimes milk, but food always. For confectionery he had no relish and no use.

With our purpose fixed before us, what shall be placed first in our scheme of work? The reply is obvious. The church should give its personality, its numbers, its forces, its graces, to make the plans effective. With this, failure is impossible. Without this, success is impossible, or, at the best, partial and imperfect. The present method is to give over the second service to the minister and such exceptionally earnest persons as he can enlist, who are chiefly young men. These make a strong force, and often achieve considerable results. But they work under discouragement, and do not secure results which should satisfy the church. The weakness, virtually the entire weakness, of the second service is at this point.

The energies of the church are not in it. With too many, Sunday ends at noon. The stately service, the elaborate sermon, of the morning have contented them. They have received all they wish, perhaps all they need, so far as public worship and instruction are concerned. They need to feel that the Christian life and profession mean very much more than this, and that the remainder of the Sabbath should have generous regard to the "other sheep." Exceptional cases are, of course, left out of account in this discussion. There are elderly and feeble persons from whom little can be demanded beyond their sympathy and prayers. But able-bodied Christians have a duty towards those who are without, and this duty cannot be transferred.

Many persons render excellent service in the Sunday-school, and of some of these no more can be asked. But many might widen the field of their operation and carry to others the lesson they have taught to their classes. Leave out all who for good reason must be left out, and we have a strong body of men and women whose power is almost without limit. But in few instances is the power exerted. It follows, naturally, that the work is very incomplete. Then the minister and his associates, deserted and troubled, seek to make up the deficiency. They rarely succeed. They try to popularize the second service, and they weaken it in the attempt. More and lighter singing, loud cymbals and high-sounding cymbals, paintings, and story-telling, are called in to take the place of living men. The band is enlarged to make up for the absence of soldiers. Numbers are attracted, here this week, there next week; are entertained, and dismissed with no quickening of conscience, no enlargement of reverence, penitence, or charity. These "attractions" are not named that they may be censured, but only that it may be seen what a wretched makeshift they are for men. These methods are exhausting. They call for continual novelty. They impose a costly competition which is not healthful. In many instances they put our serious ministers and churches into a rivalry where they are not on equal terms with others. In spectacular worship the Papist easily excels us. Our ritualism is a feeble and febrile imitation. On our own lines, which are firm and simple, we shall do our best work. It is in the presence of the second service that we need to assure ourselves of this, and in patience to be strong.

Let us draw closer to the heart of the subject. It is asked, what can the church do more than it is doing? The general reply is, that the members of the church can make the service their own,

for the special benefit of those who are without. They can take this into their plans, and have it as distinct and imperative as the first service. Questions of personal need and personal convenience can be set aside, and the "other sheep" can have the first and last consideration. With this the details will arrange themselves. What will the men and women do? Several things. They will go after those whom they would reach and invite them individually to the service. The master will ask his workmen, the mistress her servants, and both their neighbors. Sometimes they will call for them and walk to the house of the Lord in their company. Or they will meet them at the door and welcome them, conduct them to their seats, sit with them and around them; read, sing, pray with them; look at them long enough to recognize them on Monday. They can be friendly and speak the word of encouragement or counsel. They can linger with them at the after-meeting, if one is appointed; or make an after-meeting of their own; or follow the sermon during the week with personal enforcement, in sympathy and sincerity. They can win others as they themselves were won, by personal interest and influence, and bring them one by one into a Christian life which shall be real and constant, and into the fellowship of the church. There is no substitute for work of this kind, and there is hardly a limit to its usefulness.

With this preparation and environment the preacher's work is clear. He is to preach the gospel, and so to present it that it shall reach the heart and change the life. The design is conversion, instruction, inspiration. This end will be gained, and, from a feeling deeper than an ordinary interest, the hearers will desire "that these words might be spoken to them the next Sabbath." Perhaps there may be fewer to come than on the "popular" plan; but there will be more who are helped and made helpers of others. One young man thoroughly converted and quickened for work will be worth a score whose sensibilities have been played upon for an hour and have received no impress which will abide for a week. We must learn to care less for numbers. Counting tells little about a congregation. What is present, and for what reason, and with what result, are the vital questions. The one important point is, that the church, the members of the church in general, shall take up this endeavor as their own, and throw into it a compact and persistent energy. There can be no failure where this is done.

Is this ideal? Possibly. Should it be? Will it be when we

are true, and our sacramental vows are paid? Will it be when the Holy Spirit comes in person into willing hearts and earnest lives? It is the New Testament ideal, — Ye are the light of the world. Let your light shine before men. Ye shall be my witnesses. Let him that heareth say Come.

But, making all needful exceptions, and with a generous hand, we shall fail to engage all who remain. Experience compels us to say this. We will still keep the divine ideal before us, and meanwhile persuade into the employment all we can, and move on with these cheerfully and hopefully, not blaming others, not discouraged because of their absence, but brave in a divine purpose and under a divine command. This is the most to which we can at once attain. But this will bring large results, and in time the constancy of the few will draw from the ranks of the many. There is, indeed, a pitiful contrast between the first and second service in most churches. It is not strange that ministers and deacons lose heart, and "the ways of Zion do mourn." It is not strange that church statistics are dry reading. Still, the duty is clear: to push forward the forces which we have, and to enlarge them as we are able. Even as it is, much good is done. Many churches have large, if not complete, activities, and their efforts are crowned with a liberal response. There is enough result wherever there is effort to make it plain which way success lies, and to make us long with an intense longing for that which it is the duty of the church to secure.

When the second service is cared for in this manner, whatever will enrich it has its place. The sermon will adapt itself to its conditions, and will be serious and interesting; interesting because serious. Men have souls, and he who reaches them holds the men. Perhaps the strength of the preacher will be directed towards Sunday evening. His morning congregation is established and regular. The strain is at night, and often, perhaps oftenest, his most careful preparation should be devoted to making his sermon then effective. He must not trifle with his evening audience if he would hold it and serve it.

The church is entitled to the best music. The evening service needs this. It should be spiritual and ennobling. The degree of prominence given to the singing and the character of the hymns, will be determined by circumstances. But in both earnestness and helpfulness will be regarded. Happily we now have hymns and tunes of a high order which the people like. The evening may well be different from the morning, while they are one day.

The evening service may be varied, fresh, brisk, while yet it is dignified and churchly; suited to the hour, the house, and the design of the assembling.

In many cases where the second service is conducted with energy it has received what is technically called an "Evangelistic" character. The term is a good one, but may be unduly restricted. It means in its ordinary use the purpose and effort to bring men to immediate repentance and faith. It sings and preaches to this end. It repeats and enforces the call of the gospel. Its continual and peculiar cry is, "Come to Jesus," "Come to Jesus just now." In its place nothing could be better than this design; and the words which express it are most convincing. Christ and Him crucified we are to preach without interruption. This is our office and stands in our opportunity. Yet it may be questioned whether some do not dwell too exclusively upon certain endeared phrases and modes of appeal, so that these lose much of their impressiveness. It is a painful fact, that men become so accustomed to the most sacred words that they are not moved by them. The summons to Jesus moves them no more than the invitation to a neighbor's house. Choirs and congregations may sing —

Jesus, lover of my soul,
Let me to thy bosom fly,

when they have no love for Him, and not the slightest intention of flying to his breast. It is well, therefore, to vary our terms, especially at a service which seeks immediate results, and which aims largely at the affections and will. We must not cheapen our best words. There is no need of this with the copious language of the Bible and the numerous illustrations of its precepts. Let pains be taken to secure the best modes of appeal, that fresh sentences may engage the ear and find the heart. To this the preacher and those who are with him may well give heed.

The second service should, by all means, be evangelistic. But the evangel is broad, even in its expression; and while its truths are steadily kept before the people, there may be variety in the mode of their presentation. The gospel should be presented in its simplest form, and men called to believe it and to live in it at once. But while we keep the Cross and its single appeal central, the truths which belong with it and are a part of it are to be prominent, and made tributary to its one design. The Christ himself, his advent, character, life, death, resurrection, ascension; his parables and other teachings, his promises and warnings, his

miracles, belong naturally with the summons which would bring men to Him. The nature of man, his character and conduct, his place and privilege; repentance, conversion, regeneration, and the Christian life and destiny, belong with the summons. Here is a wide range of themes, capable of large illustration, and all of them centre in Christ. But the range is even wider. The gospel is set in a history whose course may be traced with profit,—its large and small events; its conspicuous and obscure men; its manifold lessons concerning the ways and purposes of God, and our own duties and relations. All these, again, are organically connected with Christ, and may be made to enforce the call by which we would bring men to Him. One preacher found it profitable to study the gospel in Genesis, and to show that its principles are as old as man, and are found when first God is seen with men, directing, chastening, recalling them; that law and grace are both seen, and not dimly, in the earliest pages of our history. "The Gospel in Ezekiel" is the title of a volume of Dr. Guthrie's impressive sermons. "The Witness of the Psalms to Christ" has made a very interesting book. "The Soul's Pilgrimage and Exodus" is the name of another series of helpful discourses. The material is abundant for sermons which shall edify and interest, and shall bring men in faith and love to Christ. The Epistles of the New Testament are full of truth which it will be profitable to preach to the people, and which has been written for their instruction. The preacher may, therefore, broaden his thought and study, and extend his themes and diversify his methods, and make his second service fresh and strong.

It is a mistake to think that the people will not bear instruction; that only, or mainly, their feeling and will must be addressed. Men are interested when they are learning. Teaching need not be dry. If preaching is dry and hard it is the preacher's fault, or misfortune. Besides its immediate religious uses, the second service might well be used to elevate the hearers; to set them a-thinking; to arouse their powers and give them vigor; to make their whole character robust. Esteeming the Bible as we do, we should honor it by using it more fully, and giving to the people the whole body of its truth, in proper portions and in fitting methods.

A very proper use of the second service may be found in teaching the virtues which belong in the Christian life. They form an interesting list of topics for the preacher, and the people need to learn them. There may or may not be danger that coming to Christ and entering the church will be regarded as the sum

of Religion. The mind will bear enlightenment, and the conscience quickening. There is need that morality be raised to a higher plane, till it is regarded as an essential part of piety, without which what is called religion is vain. Benevolence, justice, truth, purity, order, are cardinal virtues. No demands of business, no customs of society, no bribes or allurements are to be allowed to draw a man away from integrity to falsehood. This must be said and repeated, and young men must hear it, till the word sinks into their life. Sunday night is well employed if it produces character, manhood, which will stand against all assaults. Then there are virtues which may be classed as minor while they are of great importance; such virtues as punctuality, courtesy, gentleness, which are honorable in themselves and adorn the life of which they are a part. The range of Sunday-night teaching may fairly be wider than this. It may include reading, conversation, companionship, amusement, and other interests of this grade. Though the themes be common, they can be treated with dignity, and set to the high purpose of the service. All the virtues of a Christian life he may properly be taught, and that the man must possess them; that while they are not religion, and are not to delay the first steps in a religious life, he is with all diligence to secure them, adding to his faith virtue, and crowning his life with charity. He is to be taught that these are the fruits of a renewed heart, the fruit of the spirit; and that he is to secure them by receiving the Holy Spirit and living under his control.

Some preachers select subjects of a more profound sort than these, and greatly edify their hearers. Lectures upon large themes are usually timely and interesting. But the common experience has been that, while such lectures are of value and will attract the thoughtful and studious, they fail to meet the wants of those who most need the second service, and also fail to attach to the church, or the congregation even, those who are drawn by the discourses and held while these continue. They are not a substitute for the more personal and direct preaching for which the second service is commonly sustained. So long as there remains so great an ignorance of religious truth and duty, and so great an indifference to religion, the purpose should be to state and restate, to illustrate and enforce, the primary principles of the Christian life. There are other places for other themes. The preacher has enough in his own province to employ his powers and reward his desires. The highest and broadest results of his scholarship belong in his pulpit, but he is right when he makes them serve the

design to which he is appointed. The closer he comes to the people the richer is his life. It is to him refreshing to leave his stately discourses on difficult themes, and to come to the people with the plainest story of the Cross, seeking and saving them by its power and grace. There is nothing more delightful than this. Preaching, praying, studying have new vigor and enlargement when the end is immediate, and his soul is cleaving to the soul of his brother. Every service should be helpful to the preacher. The second service should be peculiarly stimulating and sanctifying. It will be, if it keeps to its purpose. The joy of saving men will enlarge and uplift his life. The morning will be enriched from the treasures of the night. Here is a point where those who esteem him for his own or his work's sake can aid him with rare helpfulness. Let them join him in his own work and their own work for the "other sheep," and he and they will rejoice together.

In all we are to remember that we are dealing with the souls of men. They are spirits, though the spirit is erring and guilty. They will respond to spiritual truth, presented with spiritual fidelity. The men are to be held in honor, their nature, their immortality respected. Then can we serve them and save them, at morning and at night, persuading to make up their purpose and character, "not after the law of a carnal commandment, but after the power of an endless life."

It has not been the design of this article to furnish a code of rules for the second service. Too many special adaptations are required to make this feasible. The simple intention has been to indicate the general principles which must control the service. These are not hard to find or to apply. Perhaps they are simpler than we suppose. Preaching has suffered from being made different from other kinds of instruction and persuasive address. The services of the church have suffered from having the stress laid on the church rather than on the service, on the building more than on the men. What is to be accomplished is the first inquiry, and this can be intelligently answered. The answer must construct the method. The will finds its way. There is only one point of great difficulty, and that has been stated already. It will bear repetition. To persuade the members of the church in general, or to a large extent, to be present at the second service, and to make it by their united labors what it needs to be, is, beyond comparison, the hardest part of the whole effort. When the evangelistic, missionary, christian spirit shall prevail, and the body of disciples shall follow Christ, seeking to save, the church

will gain the world. The Spirit of God moving in the spirits of men will give them divine power before which indifference will be broken and ignorance will flee away. We have expanded the idea of a Christian life so far that already we perceive it is not enough to go to heaven, or now to read our title clear. We are coming to feel that, whether in the Master or the disciple, the purpose is, not to be ministered unto, but to minister. Let this conviction become general and active, and the church will feel the impulse. There remains one saying of the Lord, to which we look in reverent wonder as it rises before us, which begs to be translated into our life. *Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that believeth on me, the works that I do shall he do also ; and greater works than these shall he do.*

Alexander McKenzie.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

THE EVOLUTION OF THE RELATION BETWEEN CAPITAL AND LABOR.

THE object of this paper is to sketch, as plainly and briefly as possible, the various changes which have taken place in the relation of capitalist and workman, to point out as well the various causes which have led to these changes, and to indicate the significant bearing which these facts have upon the solution of the labor problem of the present day. The relation of capitalist and workman has gone through some very interesting phases of development during the last century and a half. I hope to be able to show, not as a matter of theory, but as a matter of fact, that the present aspect of it is not a haphazard one, but the necessary outcome of its previous phases. Hence it will be from a careful examination of that evolution that we must hope to determine the future. We may thus be able to avoid some of the disastrous consequences which overtook our not very remote forefathers, much to their surprise.

To the thinking men and women of the day the restless movements of our laboring thousands are of the deepest interest. Most of these will admit that the question of the workman's position in the industrial world, or his relation to the capital of the country, is the most important which presents itself to modern society for solution. Other questions, such as those of land and population, are certain to have great interest for the future of our

country, as they are beginning to have for the present of some of the older countries. To determine the future relations of capital and labor, however, is the industrial problem which has fallen to our lot for solution.

The present position of the workingman is one of unstable equilibrium. The labor and capital of the country are far from being at peace with each other. They are gradually drawing off into separate camps, and organizing their forces for active hostilities. From time to time they come into open conflict with each other. This serves to increase the bad feeling, while it also teaches them much as regards their methods of warfare which will enable them to make a general conflict most disastrous. All this while we are ever being told by a certain class of persons that there can be no real conflict between capital and labor,—that such is impossible on the face of it. They will demonstrate to a certainty that their interests are identical. Doubtless they are identical, but it is in the same sense as that in which the interests of the King of France and of the Duke of Burgundy were identical when they both desired the same town. Stated in general terms, the present relation between capital and labor is this: The capitalist, on his side, regards the workman as he does any other agent in production. It is his object, and a natural one, to get his machinery to turn out as much as possible at the smallest cost; but just in this same light does he regard his workmen. The workmen, on the other hand, have usually no other object than to make as good a living as possible, with as little exertion as need be. This is not at all a bad motive in the abstract, but they make no distinction between an employer and a natural agent. Indeed, the great source of conflict is the fact that both capitalists and workmen treat each other as they do natural objects and powers, namely, as sources of wealth or income. Given ordinary human nature, and the conditions of the wage system, it is impossible that anything but a condition of hostility could be the practical outcome. Under such conditions, no amount of lecturing, or ever so persuasive argument, will bring capital and labor into general harmony. The capitalist is working for his profits, the laborer for his wages. Where both shares have to come out of the same fund, it follows that if one is increased the other must be diminished by just that amount. Where the capitalist and laborer are so far removed from personal contact with each other and intimate understanding of each other's position as at present, what more natural—what more inevitable—than

that there should be difficulty over the division of the joint products. Now here there is need to note carefully that the difficulty is not to be laid at the door of the competitive system. The relation between capitalist and workman is not one of competition. Competition consists in outbidding one another in the purchase of goods, or underselling one another in the disposing of goods, and this applies to whatever a man requires to buy, or whatever he has to sell. Competition, then, takes place between one capitalist and another, or between one workman and another, but not between capitalists and workmen. Employer and employed work together in the production of wealth, hence there is no competition there. They quarrel over the division of the products, and there is no competition there. The difficulty is not to be got over by abolishing competition, however desirable that may be on other grounds. The problem resolves itself into this: How are we to do away with the absolute antagonism between capitalist and laborer which results from the quite arbitrary division of products which at present prevails? This principle of division plainly rests on the ground that "might is right, and justice the interest of the stronger." But before we can proceed to suggest any solution for the problem we must ask how long this condition of affairs has prevailed, what it was that brought the industrial world to such a pass, and what it is that keeps it there. For unless we know something of these conditions our attempts at remedy must be mere gropings in the dark. They may even tend to aggravate the evil. At any rate, they cannot hope to be lasting and progressive unless we understand the conditions of our progress up to the present. If we find the evil to rest with man alone, if it is a moral or social one, the remedy must be of a moral or social nature. But if the evil is due to the material conditions under which man exists, then it must be our endeavor to modify, as best we can, these material conditions.

In considering the causes which have led up to the present relation between capitalist and laborer, our concern is more directly with the industrial development of the last century. But this can be explained only by going still further back. Let us see, then, what were some of the earlier phases of industrial development. Here, as in other historical matters, we must refer to Europe, and especially to Britain.

During the Middle Ages industrial competition was almost unknown, except in a few important European centres of distribution, and even there it was limited. The wage system also seems

to have been as little known. The first definite mention we have of wages in Britain is about the middle of the thirteenth century. Coöperation, and not individualism, was the rule in the production and distribution of wealth. The great monastic institutions which controlled so much of the land and wealth of the country were more or less communistic, or at least coöperative, in their industrial capacity. The industrial side of the feudal relation was also essentially coöperative. There was, of course, a marked social distinction between the feudal lord and his dependants, yet not so marked or so odious as the relation which was afterwards established, and which Carlyle has aptly termed the "cash-nexus." In England the decline of the feudal system was marked by the growing independence of those who cultivated the land, and these formed the bulk of the population. Their military service was no longer exacted, and their dues or rent became fixed in amount, though payable in the products of their labor. Such, in outline, was the condition of affairs, particularly in England, at the beginning of the fifteenth century, which is usually supposed to mark the close of the Middle Ages.

The fifteenth century, by the common consent of social historians, contained the golden age of the lower orders in Britain. In the lower orders are included all who did not belong to the aristocratic class. Up to this time there were really but two classes in Britain, the aristocracy and the masses. The cultivators of the soil cannot be distinguished from the workmen, who in almost all cases had plots of ground, even those in the towns. They had, too, a general right to pasturage on the common lands, which were then extensive. Now we find that never before, or since, did the lower class live in such comfort, and even luxury, as during the fifteenth century. Compared with some of their later representatives, they were "clothed in purple and fine linen, and fared sumptuously every day." Indeed, the government thought it necessary to pass sumptuary laws limiting the extravagance of the lower orders in the matters of clothing and food. Yet, strange as it may appear, this golden age was brought about, in great measure, by no less terrible agencies than war and pestilence. The wars with France and Scotland, together with internal strife, but chiefly those dire epidemics known as the "black death," which, from time to time, had scourged a people of unsanitary habits, had so reduced the population that those who were left found themselves able to make their own terms with the upper class. Besides, the restless, thriftless portion of the men had

been taken as retainers by the nobles who were fighting the Wars of the Roses. These conflicts seem to have affected but slightly the real prosperity of the country. An extensive exchange of goods would have been impossible, but then there was little need for it in those days. The people in almost every part of the country produced their own food, built their own houses, and made, throughout, their own clothing. What else they required could be obtained from the craftsmen in the nearest village. Most modern luxuries were denied them, but they were content to have the necessities of life in abundance.

Next we have to ask what it was that brought about the fall of the lower class from a position of affluence to one of poverty, accompanied by pauperism. First of all, we note that the fifteenth century, with its high wages and low prices, made possible the rise of the middle class by industry and thrift. With them there comes the accumulation of capital and the first marked influence of a capitalist class. It was at the close of this century that America was discovered, and that commercial enterprise and the shipping industry made such rapid progress, all of which partly resulted from and greatly stimulated the rise of the capitalist middle class. For a long time, however, capital concerned itself mainly with the exchange of goods. Most of the manufacturing was done by individuals, assisted by apprentices, and perhaps by a few journeymen, all, however, within trade guilds. At that time it was the object of both masters and workmen to keep down competition. Their guilds were fenced about by legal enactments and their own regulations, thus making it impossible to work independently of them, and yet difficult to secure an entrance to them. The master workmen in these unions were, of course, among the members of that middle class which began to control the production and exchange of goods. But there was as yet almost no opposition between masters and men. They worked together as a unit, their interests being identical. The beginnings of capitalism were not marked by that antagonism between masters and workmen which is so prominent a mark of its modern form. Neither were there a few masters with a great many workmen, but many masters, with a few men each. This general system, with certain minor changes which we shall note later on, prevailed down to the last century, and represents, in its later form, the first relation of labor and capital in America, though the new conditions here made it more lax than in England. But while the masters retained and continued to better their posi-

tion after the fifteenth century, the workmen did not fare so well. Their position was tolerably good till well on in the sixteenth century; then various causes began to work which soon brought him low indeed, wherever he was not protected by the guilds. War and pestilence had passed away, and population rapidly increased, especially among the working-classes and cultivators of the soil. The nobles, their wealth greatly reduced, in many cases wholly gone, in consequence of their struggles with each other, were compelled, both by law and poverty, to disband their hordes of retainers. These increased the number of laborers, or became thieves and vagabonds. Then, too, the great monastic institutions were abolished, and their lands divided among the existing aristocracy or court favorites, who were soon found to be much harder landlords than the monks. The troops of hangers-on round these monasteries were also added to the growing company of laborers. Again, the landed gentry, some eager to repair their fortunes, others influenced by the growing desire for wealth, began to inclose the common lands before shared among the laborers, and thus a considerable source of the workingman's income was taken away. Under the influence of a growing commerce, the value of English wool rapidly increased, with the consequence that the large land-holders turned as much as possible of their land from agricultural to pasturage uses. Now when we remember that the working population of England consisted very largely of agricultural laborers, we can imagine the effect which those joint influences had upon the position of the working people. Many were deprived of the opportunity to make a living, or part of it at least, from the soil, and many more of the opportunity to get employment. The general result was that the number of those seeking employment was much greater than the number of those who could find it. Cobden clearly summarized the height of good fortune for the workingman as "two masters after one workman," and the depth of his bad fortune as "two workmen after one master." The first was the position of the workingman in Britain at the beginning of the sixteenth century, the latter his position at the close of it. But while in this position, the worst blow of all fell upon him. This was the debasement of the coinage begun by Henry VIII, and continued during the next two reigns. The immediate effect was to increase the price of everything in demand, which meant to increase the price of the necessities of life, but not the price of labor. The base money was issued by weight, so that while the laborer seemed to get the

same wage as before, it was really reduced. In the language of "Political Economy," the *nominal wage* remained the same, the *real wage* was greatly reduced. The government, however, did not get all the advantage of the debasement of the coinage. The capitalist employing class secured the remainder, through the increased price of their goods in proportion to the cost of labor. Thus, considerably within one century, were those who virtually formed one class in society divided into two, and forced so widely apart that they have ever since remained distinct, and only of late have a minority of the lower class been able to raise themselves out of their precarious position. At that time, too, pauperism first made itself felt in England, and has ever since been a curse to the country. When the condition of the wage-earning portion of the population falls below a certain point, it is impossible for them to improve their condition through competition with the upper and middle classes, because they have not the necessary capital, and their very competition with each other for the means of living prevents them from ever acquiring it.

I have directed attention at some length to the condition of the workingman during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, for it shows us, on the one hand, that it is possible for society to exist without a large portion of the working population being in poverty, and, on the other hand, that it was through no fault of his own, nor from any direct necessity of Nature, that the workingman was brought low. But, being once brought down, it was impossible for him to regain his old position. It was doubly hard for him in Britain, for, being once reduced, he was held down by stringent acts of Parliament. He could not combine to raise wages; he could not move about from one part of the country to another to seek employment; he could not even emigrate, except as a virtual slave. There was but one possible course left, and that was for the lower class to restrict its numbers until wages increased, from the demand for labor, and independence was once more made possible. This course we could hardly expect the laborers to follow, and hence they remained in their low position right on to the present century. This general position I find verified by Professor Thorold Rogers, in his "Six Centuries of Work and Wages." Speaking of the laborer's position, he says: "For more than two centuries and a half the English law, and those who administered the law, were engaged in grinding the English workman down to the lowest pittance, in stamping out every expression or act which indicated any organized discontent, and in

multiplying penalties upon him when he thought of his natural rights." Against these conditions the laborer had no appeal, and they have been removed only within the last seventy years.

We have before us the general relation of capital and labor down to about the middle of last century. We may now note briefly the next phase in the evolution of that relation. As I have stated, manufacturing for the most part was done by master-workmen, their apprentices, and journeymen. Ordinary laborers were engaged to procure raw materials and perform the various services not immediately connected with the technical part of production. There were thus a great many manufacturers in proportion to the quantity of goods produced. As communication between the various parts of the country was improved and the trading class increased in importance, competition began to exert its influence and to break up the power of the old guilds. The writings of Adam Smith and other early economists hastened this change. It was pointed out that these artificial arrangements hampered trade; and under the changing conditions of trade they certainly did. The principle of *laissez-faire*, of absolute freedom in all matters of trade and production, was advocated, and soon held all but complete sway. Not long after the time of Adam Smith competition reached its zenith. As the mechanical contrivances for aiding production were as yet simple and inexpensive, the number of manufacturers was very large. On the other hand, a great many dealers were competing with each other for the profits of distributing the manufactured articles. These manufacturers and merchants, though numerous, were able to become, if not wealthy, yet very well to do. Very few of them needed to suffer from want if they were reasonably industrious. They formed the great body of the middle class whose rise we have already noticed. We are now considering them when competition has become the ruling principle in all industry. The old form of coöperation was found to be too binding, and discredit had been thrown upon it by the many cumbersome acts of Parliament with which industry had been fenced about. The cry for freedom had prevailed. The results justified the demand. The assumption was natural that the greatest good was to be secured to each and all by allowing every one to take his own way to make money, provided that he respected the ordinary laws of property. This is akin to the moral argument that if each one seeks his own greatest happiness the greatest happiness of the whole community cannot fail to be secured. This, however, is in both cases to make the individual

everything, to teach man that selfishness is the watchword of life. Still, this principle of *laissez-faire* was a better one than that which had preceded it. It introduced a necessary stage in industrial evolution. It did nothing, however, to better the lot of the too numerous workers. The workman was not on a competitive footing with his master. He could compete only with his fellow-workmen, and the more vigorous this competition the worse became his lot. But free competition between manufacturers developed modern enterprise and invention, because the manufacturer could effectually appeal to Nature for help if only he had the art to persuade her. Nature could help him with steam and water power, and by means of an indefinite number of mechanical contrivances known as machines he could get Nature to help him to a truly wonderful extent in his competition with his fellow-producers. Thus free competition both drove men to seek out these inventions and enabled them to make the best use of them when discovered. But the fact of a man being able to get Nature to exert her powers for him made it possible for him to quite surpass his competitors. For a time the power of competition was arrested by the actual monopoly which the man with Nature for his ally had secured. Thus did competition bring about its own defeat.

This defeat brings us to the second great change in industrial society. The conditions of the sixteenth century had divided the lower portion of society, depressing the peasant and laborer, and elevating the middle class. In the first half of this century the conditions which brought about the defeat of competition produced a similar division in the middle class, chiefly in the manufacturing, and to a less extent in the distributing, portions of it. The mechanical devices and machines which were introduced, along with the application of steam power, enabled some of the wealthier or more ingenious manufacturers to drive their fellows out of the field of production. The number of producers was thus greatly diminished. Then came the question, What must the others do? They could not remain idle and starve, hence they were forced by the very pressure of circumstances out of the master class into the laboring class. They had now to seek employment from their former competitors and to increase the competition in the ranks of labor. A few of them would find employment as foremen and managers, and, as sometimes happened, might regain an entrance to the employing class as partners in the business. Certainly the wealth of the country was enor

mously increased, but it is not hard to discover who benefited by it. The capitalists soon became very rich, as we find in both Britain and America, and yet the laborers were not greatly benefited. In Britain they were for some time worse off than ever, and would have been in America had population been excessive.

Now the principle of competition had tended to make men individualistic, selfish, caring for no one else. It had also tended to make them greedy of gain and emulous of each other. Their success only heightened the passion for wealth and distinction. They seemed to care nothing as to how they ground down their workmen. Indeed, they were being further and further removed from a true knowledge of their position, and knew them only as instruments of production. The sole idea of the capitalist was the reduction of the cost of manufacture. This is quite a praiseworthy purpose as regards the agency of Nature, for Nature can stand such reduction to any extent. Man, however, cannot endure a constant reduction in his wages without soon ceasing to exist, and, worst of all, enduring a great deal of misery before he actually gets to the ceasing point. Not many, however, actually get to that extreme directly; they usually remain at the miserable stage. This was the case of the English workmen at the time of the development of modern industry. When they appealed to their employers they were met with the not very encouraging reply, that the matter was all in their own hands. "The fact is," said the employers, "you are too numerous. At any time there is, according to an economic law, so much money to be spent as wages. Thus the wages of each workman will be determined by the number of workmen among whom the whole amount is to be distributed. Political economy tells us," they urged, "that the wage fund cannot be increased, therefore, our dear friends, you will clearly perceive that we cannot help you. Your only remedy is to diminish your numbers." Having thus shifted the responsibility from themselves to Nature, or to the workman himself, they could enjoy the prospect of their ever-increasing thousands without any qualms of conscience. But, as Carlyle says in "*Sartor Resartus*," "there must be something wrong. A full-formed horse will in any market bring from twenty to as high as two hundred Friedrichs-d'or; such is his worth to the world. A full-formed man is not only worth nothing to the world but the world could afford him a round sum would he simply engage to go and hang himself." Yes, there was something wrong; the

laborer felt sure of it; and when he was allowed to combine with his fellows in order to sell his labor as dear as might be, he was not long in discovering that those laws styled "natural" and "inexorable" were not so adamant after all. He made the important discovery that wages could be increased without diminishing population, increased, namely, at the expense of the employer's profits. Naturally enough, the workingman began to look on Political Economy as no friend of his, but as simply an organized defense of the rich man's position and methods with regard to wealth. It is only recently that the workingman is beginning to recognize that true Political Economy is not his foe, but considers his case quite impartially, and that the study of economic principles is as much to his advantage as to that of his employer. Of course he must recognize that there is a ground of truth in the position that his wages may be affected by his numbers, and that even combination will not save him when they are too large; but all this on different principles than those urged by the capitalists who took refuge in the wages-fund theory.

Now the repeal of the laws against the combination of laborers, which took place in 1824, marks the end of general competition among laborers. So long as there were more laborers than could find employment easily, so long it was impossible for any advance in wages to take place, because no individual could induce an employer to raise his wages when the employer could get others to take his place. The engaging or not of an individual workman made no difference to the employer who had plenty of men seeking to enter his service. But the having or not having employment was a most serious matter to the individual workman. So from the sixteenth century to the nineteenth the employer had it all his own way, and would have had it even yet had not the laborer been allowed by combination to produce an artificial dearth of laborers, and thus cause wages to rise.

But through the operation of trades unions, following the breaking up of the old system of production, a feeling of antagonism has been developed between workmen and employers. This is partly due, also, to the utter lack, in these days, and especially in America, of such personal interest in each other as formerly existed, and which made it an inhuman thing for an employer to set his workmen adrift whenever he pleased. All social bonds between the two have been severed. All fellow-feeling, all human sympathy, is gone. Many an employer takes less interest in his workmen than in his machines. His machines

are his and their injury or destruction brings loss to him. His workmen, however, are like hired machines, out of which the most that is possible is to be taken, and for whose loss or injury he is not responsible. The cash-nexus has taken the place of all other bonds. Its conveniences are that it may be very easily broken, and it carries with it no responsibility beyond a cash payment. Such is the state of things against which Carlyle so vehemently protests in his "Past and Present." Look at some of his statements on this point. "It must be owned, we for the present with our Mammon-Gospel, have come to strange conclusions. We call it a society; and go about professing openly the total separation, isolation. Our life is not a mutual helpfulness; but rather, cloaked under due laws-of-war, named 'fair competition' and so forth, it is a mutual hostility. We have profoundly forgotten everywhere that *cash-payment* is not the sole relation of human beings; we think, nothing doubting, that it absolves and liquidates all engagements of man. 'My starving workers?' answers the rich mill-owner. 'Did not I hire them fairly in the market? Did I not pay them to the last sixpence, the sum covenanted for? What have I to do with them more?' — verily Mammon-worship is a melancholy creed. When Cain, for his own behoof, had killed Abel, and was questioned 'Where is thy brother?' he too made answer, 'Am I my brother's keeper?' Did I not pay my brother his wages, the thing he had merited from me?" Again with prophetic insight he says: "In brief, all this Mammon-Gospel of Supply and Demand, Competition, *Laissez-faire*, and Devil take the hindmost, begins to be one of the shabbiest gospels ever preached, or altogether the shabbiest. . . . *Laissez-faire*, Supply and Demand, one begins to be weary of all that. Leave all to egoism, to ravenous greed of money, of pleasure, of applause! it is the Gospel of Despair! Man is a Patent-Digester, then; only give him Free Trade, free digesting room; and each of us digest what he can come at, leaving the rest to Fate! My unhappy brethren of the Working Mammonism, my unhappy brethren of the Idle Dilettanteism, no world was ever held together in that way for long. A world of mere Patent-Digesters will soon have nothing to digest; such world ends and by Law of Nature must end in 'over-population;' in howling universal famine, impossibility, and suicidal madness as of endless dog kennels run rabid." Nowadays things are somewhat changed. As Carlyle saw, the world could not remain in a condition of money-hunting and pleasure-hunting by the capitalist and land-holding classes

alone. The working class, when reinforced by the majority of the small manufacturers and relieved from the restraints of law, began to look to themselves for the bettering of their position. Competition between workers began to be replaced by combination between them. Then the capitalist began to perceive that the workman was a factor to be counted upon, not in competition, but in opposition. The history of the relation during the past sixty years has been marked by growing power on the part of the laborer and lessening profits on the part of the manufacturer. This makes the opposing forces more nearly equal in their strength, consequently a general conflict is more to be feared. The problem has altered but is still far from being solved. We have not yet got beyond the danger of falling into Carlyle's "impossible" state. Indeed, we seem to be coming nearer to it. His prophecy still holds good that no world was ever held together in that way for long, and unless we bring our pyramid of society into a position of stable equilibrium, destruction and anarchy still await us. In what direction, then, must we move? Is the workingman justified in combining to keep up his wages? We cannot deny that he is. Does not the whole history of his position since his golden age proclaim most emphatically that it is his only possible salvation? Without it he would lapse back into virtual slavery or pauperism. Yet it is possible for him to carry his efforts in this direction too far, and by their natural reaction to bring destruction upon himself, as he has partially done already in some cases. Is the capitalist, then, chiefly to blame for the present condition of war? In the past the capitalist was certainly largely to blame, though his responsibilities were often hid from him by ignorance and greed. In the present he is much less to blame, as a class. His power is much diminished, relatively, and his profits, except in the case of monopolies, have been cut down. But here in America within the past few years competition within the capitalist class is being replaced by combination. More and more of late have pools, rings, combines, and trusts been formed among capitalist producers and distributors to fix prices, regulate production, and oppose the labor combinations. Now, as stated at the beginning of this paper, it is precisely this organization in both camps which makes the present position of the relation between capital and labor very unstable, and the outlook for the future threatening. No world was ever held together in that way for long. The evil is not now one of oppression, but one of war. The workman is becoming more and more a match for the capitalist, and when he

gets him in his power he does not spare him. This is not quite to the credit of the workman, but it is the natural outcome of the war relation in which the two forces stand to each other. When the workman finds his employer in a position favorable for attack, with large contracts on his hands, with brisk demands for goods, then the screws are applied, and wages are either increased or great loss ensues to the producer, and even, through him, to the workman himself. But the capitalist has his opportunity when business is dull. When there is temporary over-production, and the manufacturer does not need to care much whether he shuts down or not, then he either lowers wages or throws the workman out of employment.

What, then, must be the remedy for this? Can we return to the peaceful though primitive condition of the fifteenth century, or to the independent though small producing stage of the last century? Evidently not. The perplexities of manhood are not to be escaped by a return to the careless condition of the child. Our safety lies in progress, our salvation must be wrought out. Perfect competition is evidently a thing of the past. We are moving in the direction of combination. The extensive use of machinery has made it impossible for small industries to live in competition with the larger. Great factories and mills filled with machinery, minute division of labor, centralization in production, will be the rule for the future. If, then, the workmen are not to give in to the capitalist, if they cannot return to the condition of small, independent producers, and if the present attitude of hostility is disastrous and wasteful now, with a worse outlook for the future, what is to be done? What else than for the opposing forces to combine, and, instead of wasting their energies in the endeavor to circumvent and overcome one another, to unite in overcoming natural powers and agents, conquering them for their mutual benefit. What millions are lost to America every year through strikes and lockouts! What millions, too, are lost through bad work, carelessness, lack of interest, and want of industry in working for an enemy! Does it not appear plain that there is everything to be gained by the combining of capitalists and laborers in a common production?

Before considering how this is to be brought about, let us look at two other proposals for overcoming the existing difficulties. First, it is proposed to set up boards of arbitration to mediate between capitalists and workmen, to settle their disputes, to say when wages must be increased and when they must be lowered, to

decide the number of hours during which they must work, and settle minor difficulties. This would, of course, be a great advance on the present position, and it is a principle which is being put into practice in many localities of late, with benefit to both parties. But it can never be more than a temporary measure, because it affords no permanent solution of the difficulty. In its very terms it recognizes, and even exaggerates, the opposition between the parties to the arbitration, since it draws attention so plainly to the opposition itself. Arbitration is simply a temporary means of escape, a putting off of the evil day. Yet it may prepare the way for a real solution, and is certainly the first and easiest step to be taken in establishing a basis of agreement between the hostile forces. The other proposition is, that the workmen should coöperate among themselves — should join their capital and labor in independent productive enterprises, from which they would derive both profit and wages. This implies, however, that the workmen have the necessary capital to start such an undertaking, and the skill and business capacity needed for its management. They certainly lack the capital, and cannot give security enough to borrow it as cheaply as their opponents, the manufacturers already established. Besides, granted that they have skill and business capacity, yet it is still a mere capability requiring development. Then, again, they have not the experience necessary for such an undertaking, and in gaining the experience they may be ruined. In most business transactions nowadays there is not a very large margin to work upon, and the great gains of the capitalist, which make the workmen so envious, are, in most cases, due to a small percentage of returns on a large capital rapidly circulating. True, the returns are often great in the case of monopolies, whether natural or artificial. But it is very certain that a coöperative company of workmen could not for a very considerable time enjoy any such monopolies. Such a company would have to start in some industry open to all alike, in which the profits would not allow of the borrowing of money at high rates, nor make up for any blunders in the management. Hitherto the efforts of workmen in the direction of coöperation have not been successful. It is necessary for them to pass through some intermediate stage before they can hope to both produce and dispose of their goods for themselves. The element of success lies not in merely producing goods, but rather in knowing what goods to produce, in what quantities to produce them, and how to dispose of them to the

best advantage. It is here that we find the function of the captains of industry. The successful manager, if not a capitalist when he begins, invariably ends by being one, either for himself or in partnership with his employer. This latter circumstance is quite common now. The manager who proves his ability is almost invariably admitted to a share in the business, and this is everywhere admitted to be an advantage to both parties. Now if it is of advantage to the capitalist to admit his higher employees to a share in the business, will it not pay him, from a purely mercenary point of view, to admit at least all his competent employees to a share in it also? I am quite aware that, in the present state of society, it is of little use to present any higher motive than a purely mercenary one, either to employers or workmen, as an inducement to change their business methods. Only when industrial society has reached a less hostile state of existence than the present, can we begin to present higher motives of action with any hope of success.

On grounds of pure mammonism, then, here are some of the advantages to be derived from profit sharing, which I take to be the most practicable, and yet, at the same time, most progressive and permanent method of solving our industrial problem. It is well known among business men that when manufacturers undertake to fill large contracts, and especially when they undertake to fill them within a given time, they must take into consideration the possibility, and even the probability, of a strike among their workmen. They must, therefore, insure themselves against such risks, and tender at a higher rate than the normal one. If, now, a firm or single capitalist is working on the profit-sharing principle, there is no such risk to be considered; for now it is as much to the workman's interest as to his employer's that the contract should be filled within the specified time. Such an employer and his men are therefore able to take the contract away from the others without risk of loss. Then, again, in the ordinary manufacture of goods for the market, the profit-sharing producers can sell cheaper, and yet make more for both capitalist and workmen than the others. They are delivered from all the loss, on both sides, incident to strikes and the machinery connected with them. Besides, the efficiency of the workmen would be greatly increased. Knowing that they were to share in the profits of their work, they would have every inducement to work diligently and cheerfully. They would be careful of the machines or other instruments of production which now represent so much capital. They

would avoid all possible waste of material, either in the raw condition or in the manufactured state. There would be no difficulty in getting them to do extra work when business was pressing, or to lose a little time each day when it was slack. Besides, they would not only be industrious and careful themselves, but they would see to it that their companions were so also. As things now are, manufacturers or other employers are often unable to discharge useless workmen, or even to lower their wages, because a strike would be the result. If it is asked what is to become of the useless or incapable workmen, I reply, that, while the transition is going on from the ordinary wage system to the profit-sharing system, they will simply fall to the lot of the non-profit-sharers. By the time the transition is complete, they will either have learned the necessity of becoming capable and reliable, or will simply sink into the lower grades of unskilled workmen, and be left to find a living as best they can. Profit sharing is not presented as a cure for all social evils. It is simply offered as a solution for the difficulty which exists between laborers who are capable of recognizing their rational interests and the capitalists who employ them. As to what is to be done with social incapables introduces an entirely new question. Profit sharing simply aims at saving to the two hostile forces what they spend in fighting each other, and what is lost through lack of interest on the part of workmen in the work which they are performing. The workmen's unions need not be broken up; but they could put off their warlike character and become mutual insurance and benevolent associations. They might even develop into associations for the improvement of their intellectual and social life, or for the discussion of various practical and scientific questions bearing on their occupations. When the whole of their attention was no longer taken up with fighting capitalists and devising means for their circumvention, they would have time for these other matters. Socially, the improvements brought about by profit-sharing would be very great. Consider what a different country America would be if the antagonism between workmen and capitalists were removed, and in its place a common interest established. The present position also tends to exaggerate the importance of mere wealth, and to make the getting of money the great object of life. Carlyle has well said that the Englishman's hell is the failing to get money, his heaven the securing of it. It seems to be even more true as applied to Americans. Mammonism is here, indeed, the only whole-souled worship, with

its heaven of getting money and its hell of failing to get it. But with the disappearance of the opposition between capital and labor mammon-worship would receive a severe check, and the advancement of a higher worship be made possible. The initiative to profit-sharing must, of course, come from the capitalists, and if they would but simply consider fairly its advantages, there is every reason to believe that it would soon be adopted. I know of no cases where the system has been given a fair trial and has failed. No doubt there are many who cannot be brought to accept it voluntarily; but if a considerable number of capitalists take it up, as of late they seem more inclined to do, the others will be forced to follow, or go down to the hell of Mammonism.

Adam Shortt.

QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY, KINGSTON, CANADA.

"THE INTELLECTUAL LIFE OF AMERICA."

A SUPPLEMENT.

IN a suggestive article in a recent number of "The New Princeton Review,"¹ Professor Charles Eliot Norton discusses "the effect of our material prosperity, our democratic institutions, and other national conditions upon the character and development of the intellectual life in America." The topic is a wide and a many-sided one: it is hardly possible to read generalizations upon it without sundry marginal interrogations. Few subjects have been more attractive to the finer spirits of this century than the effect of certain changes in the outward conditions of civilization upon the inner, the spiritual life of the race. In its broadest aspect the thinker of to-day can find no social problem fraught with more momentous consequences, for it is but the present phase of the old struggle between the material and the spiritual.

Professor Norton confines himself to one aspect of this question, and considers that aspect as it presents itself in the United States. To write on a question with which every thoughtful American is so nearly concerned, is to provoke in the minds of many a reëxamination of an old theme. Briefly, Professor Norton's position is this: He points out once more, that the enormous growth in material prosperity during the last one hundred and fifty years has turned men's minds more exclusively to the prac-

¹ *The New Princeton Review*, November, 1888.

tical. Throughout the civilized world the objects of ideal interest have "lost strength as motives of effort," and wealth has become the chief modern form of power. He acknowledges that in our case there have been special and obvious reasons for the predominance of the material side of life, yet he is brought to this conclusion. The contrast between the Boston of the first and the Boston of the last quarter of this century is typical of a change in the country at large. Materialism among us, while perhaps at first excusable as the natural outcome of youth and sudden prosperity, instead of decreasing is spreading to an alarming extent. He writes in one place: "But who can watch the main currents of our national life, without seeing that they are running with continually accelerating speed, and fuller volume, in the channels which they have hitherto hollowed out, and in the direction which they have hitherto pursued." In support of this, Professor Norton urges our slight achievements in literature and the arts, and claims that we can no longer plead our youth in extenuation.

As to the remedy, he considers our system of popular education inadequate to counteract this downward tendency, as it gives but the "elements of culture." He finds the chief antidote to be improvements in the higher education, the colleges being in his judgment the chief barriers against "the rising tide of ignorance and materialism."

It may be assumed at the start, that all intelligent Americans are of one mind about the value of the higher education in this country as an aid to culture and high thinking. It is too plain for argument that Harvard, Johns Hopkins, and their sister colleges, help to nourish the ideal or unmercantile side of life among us, and it is likewise known to most of us that the dusty ways of life afford our higher natures but scanty fare. Clearly it is the function of the great University in all times and countries to teach our "low-thoughted" spirits the path to the mountain tops. But Professor Norton enforces his plea for the improvement of our colleges by assertions about the extent and growth of materialism among us, which are calculated to excite the gravest apprehensions.

We are led to infer that this country is advancing with ever-increasing velocity along the broad highway to intellectual ruin, and that apart from the influence of the colleges there can come no help. In Professor Norton's words: "If our civilization is to be prevented from degenerating into a glittering barbarism of immeasurable vulgarity and essential feebleness; if our material

prosperity is to become but the symbol and source of mental energy and moral excellence, — it is by the support, the increase, the steady improvement of the institutions devoted to the highest education of youth." Such a consummation means nothing less than the failure of democracy in America. Looking forward to such a dreary result as by no means impossible, we are moved to inquire: "If we are really advancing to such a fate with such gathering momentum, is it possible that the colleges can prove an effectual brake?"

It is impossible to discuss such large issues as those raised by Professor Norton within the present narrow limits. I propose merely to supplement his article with some facts which seem to point to another conclusion.

Assuming that materialism is gaining ground among us, what shall we say as to the efficacy of Professor Norton's remedy? In considering this we should be careful to define the exact nature of the problem, that we may appreciate its new form under modern social conditions. The difficulty now is not the existence of a great class who live entirely apart from all culture; it is the danger that the tone of culture itself will be debased to meet the wants of a half-educated majority. Literature is no longer written for the few but for the many, must we adopt the standard of the many or of the few? To use Professor Norton's epigrammatic phrase, must "quantity tell against quality"? Can the multitude be lifted up, or will its clamor invade the seclusion of scholarship, the sanctity of art, and the intellectual life be ruled by the majority? This is a distinctly new question; the product of the education of the masses, the child of modern democracy. Under this new order of things it is plainly a necessity to make the intellectual life widespread, rather than the precious possession of the few. This is not merely desirable in itself; experience shows that, under modern conditions, it is indispensable to the maintenance of a high intellectual standard. Working under these conditions we must leaven the whole mass, or suffer the mass to degrade the tone of literature, of journalism, of art. But for this new problem Professor Norton suggests no new remedy. According to the last Report of the Bureau of Education, in 1886 there were 67,642 students at the 345 universities and colleges then in this country. This is a liberal estimate for our purpose, as the list includes a considerable proportion of institutions which are not colleges in the proper meaning of the word. Out of a population of over sixty millions, therefore, but a small

number come under the direct influence of the college. May we reasonably hope that the proportion of youth sent to college can be increased? Statistics show that the number of students at our colleges is not increasing in proportion to the increase of population. "This relative decline," says President Eliot in a recent article, "which was pointed out nearly twenty years ago by President Barnard of Columbia College, has been very visible of late years."

Nor does it seem likely that the causes which produce this "relative decline" can be obviated. Even among the wealthier classes there is a firmly seated conviction that a college education is a positive hindrance to business success, as it forces the man to enter the lists too late and interferes with his early business training. Professor Norton complains that the claims of business pursuits are "exclusive and absorbing," but he should add that for multitudes among us they are also inexorable. The vast majority of young men among us are obliged to earn their living in some non-professional calling. They cannot be expected to be indifferent to the requirements for success. The millions that are becoming the arbiters in matters of taste must get their intellectual stimulus outside of the colleges, or else go without it altogether.

But we may not stop here. Is not the standard of our colleges themselves in danger of being ultimately determined by the popular demand? There is a law in these matters, as in all other matters of exchange, which in the end is likely to prove too strong for any one man, or body of men, — the law of demand and supply. Is it not merely a duty, but in the end a necessity, that a college should adapt its schedule to the wants of its patrons? Doubtless this argument may be pushed too far. To a certain extent, of course, the college may elevate and mould the public taste; but we may well question whether the public taste may not prove too strong in this as in other directions. In matters of the spirit as in other things people are apt to be furnished with what they choose to pay for.

If it be true, then, as Professor Norton contends, that we have taken the bit between our teeth and started on a headlong race toward mere commercialism, is it not more probable that we shall corrupt our colleges, than that our colleges will regenerate us? At the best, is not Professor Norton putting too exclusive a reliance on a remedy which reaches too insignificant a proportion of the population to be really effective? It seems clear that what is wanted is not merely the improvement of the great centres

of the higher culture, which must always remain closed to the many, but also the improvement and multiplication of methods for the *diffusion* of culture in a true and living sense.

We are brought by this train of thought to two further inquiries. 1st. Is materialism really gaining ground among us? and 2d. If the colleges cannot hope to successfully combat it single-handed, under the social and political conditions of American democracy, is there any way in which they can be successfully aided in their work? To come to any reliable conclusion about the first of these two questions would require the examination of highly complex social phenomena throughout an enormous extent of territory, and the comparison of them with previous conditions. The question cannot be solved by an appeal to the present, since the important matter is not so much what we are as where we are going. To reach any rational conclusion on this matter in a country where social conditions are so varied and so changing as in the United States is wellnigh hopeless. To look for the intellectual elevation of older cities in Helena, or in Kansas City (where, by the way, an Authors' Club has just been founded) is to ignore the first principles of mental growth. The only reasonable and pertinent inquiry is as to their direction of development. It is not an easy thing for sixty million people, constantly reinforced as they are by fresh supplies of foreign pauperism and ignorance, to do the rough work of this country and to accomplish the greater task of civilizing themselves besides. So stupendous a process should not be watched with impatience, but with a large-minded recognition of the novel difficulties of the task.

The question of the tendency of our growth in those intangible things which make the true greatness of nations does not invite easy or over-confident generalizations. It may well be that the wisest among us cannot answer it. Yet there are certain facts that it is encouraging to take into account. When we disentangle the best contributions of the American mind to literature from the mass of writing which is merely popular and ephemeral, we shall find them distinctly elevated and refined in tone, not merely unsmirched by the taint of materialism, but unqualified in their direct condemnations of it. We have shown in our literature to a marked extent an unfeigned sympathy with nature and a profound appreciation of the ideal or spiritual side of life.

We need not go to the earlier writers for examples of this love of Nature. Such writers as John Burroughs, Edith Thomas, and

Sarah Orne Jewett in prose; as E. R. Sill, Lanier, and Celia Thaxter in poetry, have continued the work of Bryant, Whittier, and Thoreau. Nor is the strain of ideality less predominant in our national literature. We have been pointed at so often as "a nation of shopkeepers," that we are content to take the current opinion about American practicality without thought or qualification. This most practical of nations has produced Emerson, whom Edgar Quinet called "the most ideal writer of our times;" Thoreau, the lofty champion of unworldliness; Hawthorne, with his marvelous apprehension of the spiritual; Lanier, whose life is unsurpassed in its absolute surrender to the service of the loftiest ideal. America, like all other nations, is subject to a mysterious ebb and flow in literary production. No literature shows an uninterrupted advance. It is true, as Professor Norton says, that the Boston of to-day does not hold the peer of Emerson or of Longfellow, but surely this does not justify an inference unfavorable to the intellectual life of the country at large. With abundant signs of a literary awakening in the South and in the West the present outlook is anything but a depressing one. American literature has shown no sturdy strength to grapple with the deepest problems of life; at its best it has delicacy and finish rather than this supreme primal power; but it bears emphatic witness to the purity, the spirituality, and the artistic instinct of the American mind. Nor does American life lack indications of our trend toward a higher plane of thought. We of the East are inclined to make merry over Chicago's boast of culture (as the youngster of ten looks down on his little brother a class or two below him), but does it mean nothing that this great, rich Western city should aspire after culture at all? Does it mean nothing that one of the first cares of our Western Territories has been to provide for popular education: that to-day colleges, museums, and art galleries are beginning to spring up all through the crude West; that almost before our eyes a lawless, frontier, mining camp in Colorado has developed into the orderly and beautiful city of Denver? The impression left on the mind by the reading of Mr. Charles Dudley Warner's recent "Studies of the Great West" is a feeling of hopefulness for our intellectual future. In a recent number of the "Easy Chair" an equally shrewd observer finds in Western Browning Societies "interesting signs of the spirit that will enrich and elevate" Western life. My own observation in the West has pointed to the same conclusion. It is no doubt natural for the trained scholar, for any man of mature and fastidious taste

like Professor Norton, to be at odds with our bustling century, and especially with our money-making America. This same nineteenth century has hurried on its way through a storm of many worse denunciations. Wordsworth retreated from its science and its unspirituality, Carlyle thundered at it, Ruskin denounced and reviled it, Matthew Arnold impaled its Philistinism with the keen shafts of his merciless irony. But materialism was in the world before modern science or modern commerce, it changes its front but not its nature, and the high spirits of every generation will array themselves against it until the millennium. It may be questioned whether it is any less ideal to manipulate stocks in the nineteenth century than it was to pursue fame by the robbery of one's neighbor in the twelfth. And for our own especial country in these bad times — for the times are always bad to contemporary judgment — let us lay to heart the conclusion of Herbert Spencer, "Hereafter, when this age of active material progress has yielded mankind benefits, then will come I think a better adjustment of labor and enjoyment," and, "It may, I think, be reasonably held that, both because of its size and the heterogeneity of its components, the American Nation will be a long time in evolving its ultimate form, but its ultimate form will be high."

Finally, however we may differ about the extent or increase of the spirit of commercialism among us, there can be no doubt that it is present to a lamentable extent. Can the colleges be effectively assisted in their opposition to this danger, or is Professor Norton right in thinking that the work must practically be left to them alone? It seems clear to me that as we are combating the spirit of materialism in the nation at large, we must not trust chiefly to institutions which can reach directly only the few, but devise means for the spread of the spirit of culture among the many. Instead of looking mainly to one agency, we should give our energies to the improvement of fifty. We should improve the schools as well as the colleges, not by the addition of studies, there are already too many, but by the refinement of tone and method. If we cannot give learning, let us be content to foster some appreciation of admirable things. This great, rich country is yet shamefully behindhand in those things which would stimulate and develop our dull sense of beauty. We should have great national galleries of painting and sculpture, great national schools of art. We should have nobler buildings, we should perfect a system of free libraries and free lectures; we should have ten thousand things to delight and elevate us where now we have but one.

Take the work done by such an institution as the Chautauqua Reading Circle, with its sixty thousand pupils, as an earnest of what new methods may accomplish. If we are to combat this hydra-headed materialism we must do it not with one but with a hundred swords. New times demand new measures. The question how to make quantity quality is a vital question; on its solution depends the real success of democracy.

It is a great aid to its solution to realize what constitutes the intellectual life. Some years ago it was admirably defined for us by Philip Gilbert Hamerton. Its essence, he reminds us, is not erudition, but "the virtue which delights in beautiful and vigorous thinking." It is impossible that all men should be scholars, or that many among us should be college-bred; but it is not impossible that the many should learn to delight in beautiful and in noble things. The inevitable drudgery of the thousands need not wholly preclude them from any share in the refreshment and help that comes through the windows of the soul.

It is the glory of our nineteenth-century democracy, — which is nothing else than the love for humanity taking more visible shape in the world, — it is the glory of our democracy to make it easier for all men to live in fellowship with the everlasting things. By all means, in the breadth of a new charity, we should help all men; for as Marcus Aurelius says in speaking of his delight in following the courses of the stars, "Such contemplations as these scour off the rust contracted by dwelling here below."

Henry S. Pancoast.

GERMANTOWN, PHILADELPHIA, PENN.

PROFESSOR SHEDD'S "DOGMATIC THEOLOGY."¹

In many respects these two large volumes offer the best that can be said in behalf of that which the author often styles the elder Calvinism. That *rationale* of Christian doctrines which was adopted in the seventeenth century by the theologians of Puritanism reappears in its main features in this treatise. The system gains something from Dr. Shedd's lucidity of expression and purity of diction. The style never labors nor becomes obscure.

¹ *Dogmatic Theology*. By William G. T. Shedd, D.D., Roosevelt Professor of Systematic Theology in Union Theological Seminary, New York. 2 vols. Pp. x, 546; v, 803. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1888.

The reader is never in doubt as to the meaning of the author, even when the most abstruse metaphysical refinements are under consideration. The work easily takes precedence among the various presentations of Puritan Calvinism, and will have permanent value as an explanation of that influential system of religious philosophy.

Three principles underlie the leading arguments and main conclusions of the work. They are: a realistic conception of "nature" as distinguished from individuality, a conception which yields the author's philosophy of the Trinity, the Person of Christ, and Original Sin; an ethical conception of the divine attributes which exalts justice above mercy and is frequently expressed in the statement that God *must* be just and *may* be merciful, a conception which yields the author's philosophy of the Atonement and of Retribution; and a conception of the divine purposes in Decrees and Election which determines the author's opinions concerning the redemption of individuals and their eternal salvation. There are secondary criteria and theories, as in respect to the infallibility of the Bible and the laws of spiritual life, but the characteristic features of the work correspond to the three controlling principles which have been indicated.

1. The first of these principles, which distinguishes nature from personality, is applied to the Trinity to predicate the unity of the nature or essence of God, as existing in the three distinctions of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. Some conception of this sort is held by all Trinitarians, with the meaning that God is not triune in the sense in which He is a single nature or being, and that the trinitarian personalities are not like human individuals, but are rather principles or distinctions of personality having a common ground as modes of existence in the one absolute, indivisible Being, although the preferable view is that the personality itself is given in the trinitarian mode of existence.

The same principle is applied to the Person of Christ, who is two natures in one person. Of course, if human nature can exist apart from actual individuals, and if the second person in the Trinity, as entering into the God-man, is the divine nature apart from personality, so that the two natures are entities without personality and can thus combine into a person, as Dr. Shedd holds, there is no trouble in accepting the exact definitions and distinctions which follow. It may be doubted, however, whether these distinctions of ontology have been of any other service than to set aside erroneous theories, and whether they do not give an air

of unreality and even improbability to the fact they profess to explain.

The principle is applied also to the doctrine of Original Sin, for the purpose of showing that men are guilty for the first sin of Adam, and thus that they are responsible and punishable for the inclination to sin which they inherit.

"The posterity could not participate in the first sin in the form of individuals, and hence they must have participated in it in the form of a race. This supposes that the race-form is prior to the individual form; that man first exists as a race or species, and in this mode of existence commits a single and common sin. The individual, now a separate and distinct unit, was once part of a greater whole. . . . The term 'mankind' (as used in the Westminster Catechism 16) denotes here the human nature before it was individualized by propagation. This nature sinned. Human nature existing primarily as a unity in Adam and Eve, and this same human nature as subsequently distributed and metamorphosed into the millions of individual men, are two modes of the same thing." "Now, if the traducian postulate be true, namely, that Adam and his posterity were specifically one in the apostasy, all that is said of the individual Adam can be said of his posterity. The posterity committed the first sin prior to its imputation to them, and it was imputed to them as a culpable and damning act of disobedience. . . . There is certainly nothing unjust in imputing the first sin, and the ensuing corruption, to the posterity on the ground that they were the author of both."

The argument runs in this way. Scripture teaches that the first sin is imputed to Adam and his posterity as sin and guilt because they committed it. This Scriptural teaching is found in Rom. v. 12: "Death passed upon all men for that all sinned." The only interpretation is that the sin which all sinned was the sin of Adam. But it would be unjust to punish men for sins which they did not commit. Therefore Adam's posterity must have participated in his sin. This they could not have done as individuals, and they therefore did it as the human nature in the first pair, previous to propagation. This is credible because the first human beings differed from all who came after in that they contained the whole of human nature as a species in themselves, and sinned in a double sense, as a species and as individuals. This immense conclusion rests on the interpretation of the phrase "all sinned," as to which there is wide difference of opinion on purely exegetical grounds. All other passages of Scripture quoted by Dr. Shedd

pertain to the fact of inherited corruption rather than inherited guilt. When it is asked why only the first sin of Adam and Eve is charged upon their posterity, the reply is that as soon as the first individual was conceived the original unity of the species was destroyed and our first parents became individuals like their descendants. When it is asked why the sins of Adam and Eve during the interval between the first sin and the conception of Cain are not imputed also to their posterity, the reply is that the first sin was against a probationary statute which was given to test the obedience of the race, and later sins were transgressions of the moral law, and this "shows that the personal transgressions of Adam after his first sin would not be imputable even to the non-individualized nature in him." That is, it is elaborately proved that by the very nature of the human species, all mankind, previous to propagation, acted in the first individuals because the whole of human nature was there of necessity, and yet, the condition of the first pair remaining precisely the same, after a single act the species was not involved. The agency of the species therefore depended on some peculiarity of an outward command, and thus on the sovereign good-pleasure of God, which we do not understand, knowing only that he pleased so to do. The common guilt of posterity for the first sin does not rest then on the laws of unpropagated human nature, because that acts now in one way and now in another, now completely and now not at all. There is just as good reason to believe that God of his sovereign good-pleasure made Adam in a single trial the representative of his posterity as to believe that our guilt depends on a law of human nature which acted only once, although for some time afterwards the conditions remained the same. But Dr. Shedd rejects the representative theory because without participation there can be no guilt. There is only one way in which we could be guilty, — by participation; there is only one way in which we could participate, — as a species; before the propagation of the species we must have participated in the nature of the case; and yet before propagation began the species did not act always but only once, and therefore did not act necessarily. And so the argument falls. The peculiarity of the command, and not the peculiarity of an unpropagated human species, involved the fall of mankind. There is little to choose among the various theories advanced to show that Adam's posterity is guilty of Adam's sin, but the most fanciful of all is the theory advocated by Dr. Shedd that the human species was concerned in the first human sin, yet,

as a species, had no relation to the subsequent sins of Adam, even those which he committed before Cain was conceived, nor to any of the sins of following generations.

The method of transmitting this race-guilt from generation to generation is soberly explained in this way: "Hence it follows, that what is strictly and purely individual in a human person must not be confounded with what is specific in him. As an individual he sins individually, but what he does in this individual manner does not affect that portion of human nature which he receives to transmit. This fractional part of the nature does not 'sin in and with' the individual containing and transmitting it. He may be regenerated as an individual, but this does not regenerate that part of the human species which he includes, and which he is to individualize by generation. His children are born unregenerate. Regeneration is individual only, not specific. It is founded upon an election out of an aggregate of separate individuals. Consequently, it does not sanctify that fraction of each individual which is deposited in each individual to be propagated. Neither do the individual transgressions of a natural man make the corrupt nature of his children any more corrupt. The non-individualized nature in his person remains just as it came from Adam. . . . It is a latent nature or principle which remains in a quiescent state in reference to his individuality. It is inactive, as existing in him. It does not add to, or subtract from, his individual power. It constitutes no part of his individuality. Not until it is individualized, and being separated from the progenitor becomes a distinct person by itself, does it begin to act out the sinful disposition originated in it when Adam fell." When a child is born, then, part of the original sin he has makes him commit all his individual sins, and part of it is stored up to be employed only if he should happen to have children, and the original sin set apart for purposes of transmission has nothing to do with the original sin he received from his parents for his own individual use. If it is thought that too much space has been given to these artificial refinements, it need only be said that discussion of the nature and apostasy of man occupies nearly one fifth of the two volumes, and has a decisive relation to the author's philosophy of atonement, justice, regeneration, and retribution.

2. Another postulate of Dr. Shedd's theology is the supremacy of justice among the divine attributes. "God *must* be just and *may* be merciful." He really means that sin deserves punishment and does not deserve forgiveness, and that so far as sinners are

concerned they can set up no claim to pardon. If justice, as an attribute of God, has a necessity, which other attributes have not, it has to be explained how a weaker attribute, mercy, gains the ascendancy, so that man is forgiven. If it is said that justice is satisfied in the sufferings of Christ, it may be replied that it is love rather than justice which originated the purpose of redemption, and that the final cause of Christ's sufferings was the salvation of sinners, not the satisfaction of justice. Salvation was the object, satisfaction a condition; not, satisfaction the object, salvation consistent with it. That compassion is necessarily felt by God is admitted by Dr. Shedd, but merely in passing, when he says "compassion towards the sinner must be felt, but may or may not be manifested by Him." Then both compassion and justice are necessary, but the necessity of justice is more necessary than the necessity of compassion. This means that justice is an active attribute, compassion a passive attribute, since it may or may not be exercised. But is it not the very nature of mercy, compassion, and love to manifest themselves in appropriate ways? There is a discrimination between the absolute and the relative claim of a sinner on God. As a matter of absolute and naked justice, the sinner deserves to be punished. In view of the revelation God has made of his disposition towards men in providing redemption, the sinner has a right to expect gracious treatment. God's government of the world is such that his mercy and love are as prominent facts in it as his distributive justice. The expectations and, relatively, the claims of men are determined by the knowledge of God they have from all his revelations, not from an idea of God we could imagine they might have if they knew Him only by unaided reason. Since the greatest and crowning revelation is in the sacrifice of Christ, that is, a revelation of mercy, may we not, under such a disclosure of the character of God, conclude that He must be merciful in order to be God, with as good reason as we conclude that He must be just in order to be God? As human justice is the guardian of rights, so divine justice may be considered the guardian of all the attributes. In justice to himself God will not be deprived of the exercise of that compassion which He "must" feel.

In relation to man, the justice of God may be believed to speak the last word rather than the first word. After God has revealed himself in his entire will and disposition, justice pronounces on the desert of man. Man might, in thought, be so abstracted from his actual state as a sinner who has already been dealt with merci-

fully, that, as a transgressor of law, he would be seen to deserve punishment, and so be considered as already under condemnation. But justice is more exalted when it is thought of as waiting till God has made all those revelations which have in view the good of man, and then, when, so to speak, the whole case is in, and man has had the full opportunity God will give him, as pronouncing solemn sentence. Therefore, the great judgment comes at the end of the dispensation of the gospel, not previous to it, and decisions are determined by the sinner's relation to Christ, not by his relation to some other and lower revelation of God, and not, it may be added, by his relation to the sin of Adam. The world is to be convicted of sin because men believe not on Christ.

Moreover, what is called the law of God is a manifestation of his mercy as truly as it is of his righteousness. The decalogue, transgression of which, according to Dr. Shedd, exposes man to the wrath of God, was something more than a standard by which to determine whether or not men are sinners. It was a direction of life. In love and mercy to men God made plain their duty. It sketched the ideal life. It was a revelation of the holy and loving character of God which other nations did not have. To suppose that the law was given and transgressed before the mercy of God was revealed, that law was exclusively a revelation of his holiness, and that mercy was revealed afterwards, and only because law had been transgressed, and therefore to conclude that God must be just and may be merciful, as if law had to do only with his justice, and the gospel only with his mercy, is to sacrifice fact to theory. The decalogue was mercy as well as law, and the gospel is law as well as mercy. The will of God for our life is revealed in Christ, and is quite as conspicuous as the merciful provision for forgiveness of sins.

The fact is, that all God's disclosures of himself express his disposition principally on two sides: in respect to the duty of man under law, and in respect to the good of man as the recipient of blessing. On the lowest ranges of revelation, on which no positive law appears, right and wrong are recognized, and also the goodness of God, as Paul reminded the barbarous Lycaonians, "in that he did good and gave you from heaven rains and fruitful seasons, filling your hearts with food and gladness." God's revelation to the Jews was a covenant which promised blessing from Him and required obedience from them. And the gospel brings both elements to their highest value and expression. Every one's deserts, character and destiny are determined in view of the dis-

pensation under which he lives. In Christian lands one is not judged by the Jewish law and saved by the Christian gospel. He is under Christian law and Christian grace. Under this highest law he is found a sinner, but obtains grace through his knowledge of God's dispensation given by Christ. Under the Jewish dispensation, God's will was known and his grace was known. If the Jews who died before the time of Christ were to receive no clearer knowledge after death, their destiny is determined in view of the knowledge and motive they had; and so of revelations still more obscure. And if those under preparatory and inferior dispensations have, after death, knowledge of Christ, justice will pronounce sentence in view of all the light given.

The inferior and precarious position of mercy shapes the conclusions of Dr. Shedd's theology in at least two important respects. First, he concludes that the principal object of Christ's atonement was to satisfy the claim of justice, and that such satisfaction, to have any significance, must be of *equal* value with the punishment of sin. He does not hesitate to use the word "quantity" in respect to the substitution of Christ's sufferings for our punishment, and ascribes to the pains Christ endured a penal value. And, second, the author's opinions concerning the eternal destiny of men rest on the dictum "God must be just and may be merciful." It would not conflict with his conceptions of God's character to believe that all men are left to go down to eternal death. As matter of fact, the number of the lost may be relatively few, but if all mankind were lost God would be satisfied, for it would be perfectly *just*, and unfallen angels could look on in untroubled admiration. The unevangelized heathen present, therefore, no problem to the mind of Dr. Shedd. They all sinned in Adam, and deserve eternal death; they all have actually sinned, and deserve eternal death; the exercise of mercy is optional with God, and it is no reflection on his character if he puts forth no effort to save them.

3. The third postulate is the doctrine of the election of some to eternal life by the mere good pleasure of God. The relation of man's freedom to God's eternal purposes presents profound difficulty to all minds. But is it necessary that the admission of a mystery should grow into a recognized factor in the observed workings of redemption? Is it not unwise to distinguish between common grace, which is given to all who hear the gospel, and regenerating grace, which is given only to the elect; to maintain that common grace is enough to regenerate if the sinner were

not disinclined, but that regenerating grace has the peculiarity of removing disinclination; that inasmuch as, under common grace, the non-elect might, if they would, become regenerate, some of them, who wish and strive to become regenerate and apparently have right inclination, may be considered *conditionally* elect? Here is the argument: only the elect are regenerate, and they are regenerate because they have regenerating grace, and they have regenerating grace because they are the elect. Regeneration, thus, is solely the act of God. Man has nothing whatever to do with it. It is not by means of the truth, but is the direct act of God. Man may prepare himself for it, but has no share in the event itself. How it can be a spiritual change, yet without the use of truth, and by the direct omnipotence of God, how man's preparation for it is necessary, and yet man has nothing to do with it, are points of which no explanation is offered. I cannot dwell at length on the use made by the author of the doctrine of election, in addition to its scriptural use of assurance to the Christian and the church that God's purposes will not fail, but only indicate the prominence he gives it. There are two persons into whose hands I should consider it dangerous to put the chapter on regeneration: one who is skeptical or doubtful concerning the gospel, and one who, impressed with his need and duty relative to Christ, is near the point of decision. The one would be strengthened in his doubts, the other made discouraged or indifferent. Indeed, the only person who could derive advantage from perusal of the chapter is the professional theologian, who knows that the most hopeless and unintelligible theories have been entertained by men of singular piety and the spirit of martyrs.

The above account of the main currents of thought in Dr. Shedd's theology, although brief, is, I think, substantially correct. Mention might have been made of other portions of the work, such as certain chapters on the doctrine of God and of Christology, with which I find myself in hearty agreement, and which are reasoned with marked ability. But as these maintain opinions held in common by Christians, and employ arguments which have long been current, they do not call for comment in this article, which aims chiefly to point out features which are characteristic and controlling. It only remains to notice some things of secondary importance.

The most lively and entertaining chapter is that which presents arguments against "pseudo-evolution," by which is meant the

derivation of one genus from another, and therefore of man from lower orders of animals, and against the theory of a greater antiquity of the human race than from six thousand to eight thousand years. As to the latter point, the principal argument is, that in a longer period the population would have become vastly greater. But since the author believes that at the deluge the existing population of the globe, with eight exceptions, was destroyed, he, of course, means that the *deluge* was not more than six thousand or eight thousand years ago. The exploded theory of Malthus, that the increase of the means of subsistence is in arithmetical proportion, that of population in geometrical proportion, is quoted without suspicion that there are any checks to the increase of population. In this chapter only does Dr. Shedd, who is the most gentle and winning of men, pass into the satirical vein. Indeed, a charm of the work is the candor and seriousness with which some of the most improbable opinions are elucidated.

Dr. Shedd holds to the infallibility of the Bible. If there are any errors, they belong to copies, not to the original autograph manuscripts. Discrepant statements do not prove error when they occur in the Bible, for a book would not contradict itself. Only disagreement with some fact stated in other books could prove mistake. "For example, 2 Kings viii. 26, asserts that Ahaziah was twenty-two years old when he began to reign, and 2 Chronicles xxii. 2 asserts that he was forty-two years old at that time. One of these must be corrected by the other." Some copyist was in error. "According to 1 Samuel vi. 19, 50,070 men were slain for looking into the ark; seventy men probably being the number."

The reason there can be no mistake is, that if error is admitted at one point we cannot know what is true and what is untrue; therefore it is all true. Yet the books of the Bible are copies in which, Dr. Shedd admits, there may be mistakes. But if in our copies mistake is admitted at one point, how can we decide at other points what is true and what is false? We do not have the originals, but only the copies. We have to discriminate, to use our judgment, with the result that we find some mistakes in the copies, but none which impair the essential truths of revelation. It is purely a matter of opinion about the originals, for we have never had them to examine. If it was important that God should inspire a Bible which is entirely free from mistakes as to matters of human knowledge, why was it not important that he should protect copyists from mistake at the same points, especially as the

copies were to have a very wide circulation, the originals scarcely any, the copies to serve a permanent, the originals only a temporary use? I do not imply that Dr. Shedd's theory of the construction of the Bible is tenable, but that upon his own theory there is need for intelligent discrimination between the spirit and the letter, between the essential and the non-essential truths which are recorded. The author's theory of the Bible as infallible leads him to quote texts indiscriminately as of equal value. In several instances texts are not apprehended in their true meaning. It is stated that the passage in Isaiah vi. 9, 10, concerning those whose ears are heavy and whose eyes are shut, occurs oftener in the New Testament than any other Old Testament text, and six times in the Gospels, in every instance in the discourse of our Lord, when, as matter of fact, it is found in only four places in the Gospels, three of which are reports of the same discourse. The first chapter of Genesis is thought to be in accord with the best settled results of modern physics, and no notice is taken of the resemblances of the Hebrew with other Oriental cosmogonies.

Dr. Shedd has not always been careful to verify his references. In some instances, when he quotes at second-hand, he repeats the mistake of the book in which he found the quotation. He often gives the substance of a citation, omitting words and clauses, yet makes the whole an unbroken sentence, and incloses it in double quotation marks. The Westminster Confession is often treated in this way, so that those who are familiar with the exact phraseology are disturbed by the unaccustomed arrangement of words. When only the sense of a passage is given the signs of precise citation should not be used. A quotation is made from Dr. Schaff's article on "Hades" in which a sentence is taken from a division marked (c), another from an earlier division marked (3), yet the latter follows the former in a continuous sentence which is designated by quotation marks. He completely misunderstands the remark of Müller's that the eschatology of the New Testament excludes the opinion that *universal* restoration will have been completed at the day of judgment, since there are then wicked persons who are judged, by making him say that the New Testament eschatology forbids the opinion that *any* persons can repent and be saved between death and judgment. Dr. Shedd remarks on another page that Müller, in placing the time of repentance between death and judgment, appears to contradict what he says in the former quotation, the fact being that Dr. Shedd misunderstands him.

It is disappointing to discover that this system of doctrine is individualistic throughout. The kingdom of redemption is not discussed, and, so far as I can remember, is not mentioned. The guilt of individuals, the salvation of individuals, the sanctification of individuals, and the condemnation of individuals, are the themes under consideration. The author does not even present the doctrine of the church. There is no statement concerning it, except in a foot-note of twelve lines, which gives Calvin's explanation of the difference between the visible and the invisible church, and refers to a sermon of Jeremy Taylor's on the same distinction. The church is looked on merely as having the sacraments, and the sacraments are considered as means of grace to the individual. The final consummation and triumph of the kingdom of God makes no distinct part of the eschatology. The judgment is the separation of the righteous from the wicked, and is of a public character. Heaven, to which a chapter of two pages is given, is a place in which the blessedness of the believer is realized, a state which is endless, and marked by sinless perfection, by the impossibility of sinning, and by mental happiness in the vision of the divine perfections and delight in them. I cannot refrain from expressing the conviction that a system is radically defective which has no place for the doctrine of the kingdom of God on earth and in heaven, nor for the church of Christ.

The profound disagreement which has been expressed in the above notice with the leading principles of Dr. Shedd's theology concerns his philosophy or *rationale* of doctrines. In respect to the separate doctrines themselves, I am, for the most part, in general agreement with him. But the reasonings elaborated in support of them seem to me, in many respects, either inconclusive or self-contradictory. As a system of dogmatic theology, its merits must be determined in view of the methods and processes of reasoning rather than in view of the religious beliefs embraced by the author.

George Harris.

EDITORIAL.

THE PRESERVATION OF SPIRITUAL CHRISTIANITY.

THE name of the late Professor T. H. Green of Oxford has become well known to the public since his death in 1882 at the early age of forty-six, partly because he is the original of Tutor Gray in Mrs. Humphrey Ward's popular story, but chiefly by the evidence which his published works give of profound and original thought on fundamental questions of philosophy, ethics, and religion. His books are not easy reading, the thought seeming to be impeded by the effort of expression, but there is thought on every page to reward the effort of disengaging it from a labored style. His lectures were like his books. In his *Memoir*, which is before us, it is related that he had great difficulty in expressing himself, while yet the very difficulty of his utterance gave one the feeling that he was working the thing out, and not repeating other people's phrases or ideas. The third and last volume of his works, recently issued, and which contains the memoir just mentioned, includes a few essays, some of them unfinished, on Christianity as a spiritual religion, under such titles as Justification, Incarnation, the Witness of God, Faith, and Christian Dogma. Some of these essays were originally in the form of discourses addressed to students of Balliol College on certain Saturday evenings preceding the administration of the Holy Communion, and it is from two of them that Mrs. Ward quotes extended passages in "*Robert Elsmere*."

On reading these discussions of Christian doctrine one is surprised to find that their positive contents unfold conceptions of the Christian life which are strikingly Biblical and spiritual in their main characteristics, conceptions which have been held by devout thinkers in all the Christian centuries. The surprise one feels is due to the fact that Professor Green was supposed during his life to have broken away from evangelical opinions, and because the personation of him in Mrs. Ward's novel makes the same impression. And, indeed, his criticisms on the external facts of Christianity, on miracles, and on dogma indicate a wide departure from the common belief. But his opinions concerning the interior life in Christ, through the revelation and the reconciliation of God in Christ, are deeply spiritual and instructive. Paul and John are the writers of the New Testament in whom he finds the best expositions of religious truth. They grasped the innermost truth of the person and teaching of Christ as the power of a new life rising out of the life of sin and death. A single passage will suffice to suggest his leading idea.

"There came one who spake as never man spake, yet proclaimed himself the Son of man, and was conscious in the very meanness of human life, in its final shame of death, of the communication of God to himself, and through him to mankind. There came another who, bringing with him certain 'metaphysical' conceptions, the result of the philosophy of the time, found them in

this man, whom death could not hold, suddenly become real ; who in spirit, yet with a light above the brightness of the sun, saw manifested in him that which Philo and the Stoics knew must be ; even the heavenly man in whose death all barriers were broken down, that all in the participation of his life might be equal before God. 'The riches of the glory of this mystery' he preached among the Gentiles, even 'Christ in them the hope of glory.' . . . The highest result of ancient philosophy had been the conception of the world as a system of thought, related to God as his word or expression, that is, as the spoken thought is related to man. This conception, however, great as it was, did not present God under moral attributes, nor did it bring him near to the conscience of the individual. But in Christ, the writer whom the church calls St. John saw this divine thought manifesting itself in human life as truth and love, and that not merely or fully through a past visible existence — though such existence had been vouchsafed as 'a sign' — but through a spirit which should dwell in men, drawn out of the world, won from sense and the flesh forever. The presence of this spirit was the presence of the Son, so that the perfect knowledge and love which subsisted from eternity between the Father and the Son might be reproduced in men as the knowledge of God and love of each other."

Professor Green dwelt so much on the life in Christ, on the immanence of God in the Christian, and on the spiritual witness within, that his biographer thinks it necessary to defend him against the charge of mysticism.

The significance of his attitude is found in the fear he felt that the church is in danger of losing its hold on that which is the reality, the very core of Christianity, and of exalting to the first place that which is merely accessory, the external history, the miracles, the outward circumstances of Christ's birth and life and resurrection. His aim was not to abjure Christianity on account of its intrinsic incredibility as a history and on account of the insecurity of the evidence for it, but rather to penetrate to the very heart of it, the new life in Christ, so that, as at the first, the gospel might make its spiritual way, transforming individuals and society. There is, we believe, in these apprehensions an underestimation in two respects. He underestimated the value of the actual history and the outward forms in which Christianity appeared in the world, failing to recognize the indissoluble union of event and truth. But it is not at this point that we would argue now. We would notice rather his underestimation of the agencies constantly at work to preserve the spiritual conception of Christianity, and to exalt the living, present Christ as the power of new life in believers.

The Christian pulpit of to-day, with all its limitations, is a perpetual reinforcement of spiritual Christianity. More than ever before, it is occupied with the translation of truth into life. It has a single eye to the character which Christianity aims to produce. It delineates the Christian man in his spiritual qualities. It discourses much concerning the experience of the believer in Christ. Even when it urges sinners to comply with the conditions of salvation, it impresses the necessity of a

spiritual change so profound that many have felt they cannot become connected with the outward organization, the church, because they have not had conscious experience of the new life in Christ. In its religion, as in all things else, the present age is subjective. It is given to introspection. It analyzes feelings as well as thought, and reviews the very succession of processes in religious experience.

In a rough classification, the successive types of preaching may be described as historical, doctrinal, and spiritual. The primitive type, the historical, dwelt on the great events of Christianity, the crucifixion and resurrection of Christ, and the fulfillments of prophecy. During the centuries which preceded Protestantism this form of preaching predominated. The observance of the Christian year, the seasons of Advent, of Lent, of Easter, of Whitsuntide, kept fresh before the people the objective events of the gospel. The doctrinal controversies which arose centred in the sessions of councils and the authoritative promulgation of creeds rather than in the preaching which was addressed to the masses.

With the diffusion of knowledge which followed the mediæval period, and the deepening of reflection which ensued, came the popularization of doctrine. Theology was preached. The teaching of theological fathers was revived. The epistles supplanted the gospels. The creed interpreted the Bible. Dogmatic controversy invaded the pulpit and appealed to the pew. Calvinism was domesticated in the thought of the common people. The little children of Puritans both in Old and in New England were inoculated with the dogmatic abstractions of the catechism. The original stream of historical preaching flowed on in the Romish Church, and also in the Church of England, although in the latter the dogmatic element was largely commingled. But Puritanism in England and America, disdaining the festivals of ritualism and the externalities of ecclesiasticism, poured on in the unmingled stream of a doctrinal movement which controlled preaching, opinion, and Christian life. Preachers of the last century and of the early part of this century were accustomed to present schemes of doctrine in discourses arranged in order, which constituted what was called "bodies" of divinity, although in the absence of flesh and blood they might with more propriety have been called skeletons. It should be noticed, however, that from the Reformation onwards, the partly subjective doctrines of Sin, Justification by Faith, Regeneration and Sanctification were made prominent, and were emphasized in preaching even more than the objective doctrines of the Trinity, the Divinity of Christ, and Atonement.

It is generally perceived that the present style of preaching is in broad contrast with that doctrinal preaching which, being abstract and argumentative, was emphatically rationalistic. And the contrast is such that the preaching of to-day may, in the comparison, be best characterized as spiritual. It attempts to bring the living Christ to the living soul. It exalts the Christian type of character. It explains and illuminates the freedom of faith, the peace of personal trust, the consciousness of son-

ship, the newness, that is, the perennial freshness, of the life in the Spirit, the law of service, the spiritual renovation of society. Doctrines concerning the divine character and government are presented, but rather to get their use as motive than to maintain their correctness and defend them against objection. Doctrines concerning redemption from sin are maintained, but rather to recognize the facts of the moral nature in its perversion and the results of renewal in character than to speculate on the origin of sin or to analyze the method and processes of regeneration. Sunday after Sunday, year in and year out, preachers have to stand before the people with a message, and almost of necessity they must present truth in its significance for the actual, inner life.

The endeavor of modern preaching to get at the spiritual power of Christianity is so urgent that it is exposing the pulpit to a certain danger. There is a tendency to emotionalism, even to sentimentalism, which needs to be guarded. There is such a thing as too fine analysis of motives, experiences, feelings, and spiritual states. Excessive introspection produces hot-house piety. There may be too little venturing out into the open air of God's truth as it is known in the great objective revelations He has made in the world. There may be also a mystical manner of presenting the truth as it is in Jesus which leads to that vagueness and sense of monotony which always accompany unreality.

There is little danger, then, that the outward and historical will occupy too large a place in modern conceptions of the gospel. There is, on the contrary, a tendency to ignore the events through which God has made himself known and to separate spiritual truth from that body of facts in which it originally appeared. And therefore while there need be no fear that preaching and thought will become too spiritual, there may be a liability to excessive abstraction and introspection which, because they are expressed in religious phraseology, may be mistaken for spirituality. The corrective of such a tendency is in the restoration, according to a true proportion, of the historical facts of Christianity. Truth, now as ever, needs its setting. Imagination must have the suggestion of concrete embodiments. The Christ of faith must be set before men as the Jesus of history. Otherwise they will worship they know not what. A restoration in all branches of the church of the observance of the Christian year would be of incalculable advantage in restoring the sense of reality in religion.

It may be believed, as it certainly should be desired, that what is best in the three great elements of history, doctrine, and life will be combined as the church goes forward in its work of preaching the gospel of Christ. This combination is complete in the New Testament, as a basis of fact in the veritable history of Jesus and the founding of his church, a new life and a new society appearing, and a sacred philosophy of it all in the doctrinal epistles. Spiritual Christianity realized in life, which is unquestionably the intended result of the gospel, will be preserved by supplying itself at the original sources. The church was never in so

immediate contact as now with the Bible. If knowledge corresponds to the variety of gospels and epistles, if the whole New Testament becomes an open book, it is certain that spiritual life will be nourished at the roots and will branch out symmetrically in many-sided Christian life.

We heartily respond to the desire which was so earnest with Professor Green that Jesus should be to all men what He was to Paul and to John in respect to the new life emerging from sin and death, and in respect to the witness of our spirits with the Spirit of God, but we also desire that the Jesus of the gospels should be kept in near and clear perception before the world, so that the spiritual life of to-day, like the spiritual life of Paul and John, may have its conscious source in Him who was manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory.

A ROMAN CATHOLIC JOURNAL ON THE SCHOOL QUESTION.

A NEWSPAPER published in St. Louis as an organ of German Catholics and known as "The Herald of Faith" (*Der Herold des Glaubens*), translates a considerable part of the article on "Roman Catholics and the Public Schools," which appeared in the December number of this REVIEW, and comments at several points on the opinions there expressed. It is quite evident from these observations where the sensitive or, as it might perhaps be called, the strategic point of the Roman Catholic position is to be found. All effort is to be centred on the increase of parochial schools. There is no definite intention of obtaining control of the public schools, but the plan is to withdraw all children of the Romish church into schools over which it has entire control. The ground is taken that the public schools are so completely secularized that it is useless to expect any sufficient religious instruction from them, and that nothing remains but to create schools which will provide religious teaching. The complaint is, not that the errors of Protestantism are inculcated, nor that one sect rather than another has control, but that the schools are godless, so that not even the minimum of morality and religion is taught. The opinion is held that it is a wrong to children to neglect their religious training. It is also maintained that godless schools are dangerous to the true interests of America, and that Roman Catholics are better friends of American institutions than those who would allow children to grow up in irreligion. "Thus there is another great deception prevalent, for the parochial schools are wholly and entirely American, since One rules and teaches and abides in them, who, it is true, was not born in America, but who nevertheless is at home here, the Almighty God." "The school question deserves the most earnest consideration of all friends of the church and of a free republic." "Let our descendants pray in English, German, Polish, or Spanish; God understands all languages; but a race educated godlessly he understands not."

The policy of providing parochial schools, then, is perfectly distinct, and is plainly avowed by the leaders of the Roman Catholic Church in this country. The only question, or rather the first question, is whether this policy can be carried out. Have the Catholics of America the means and have all of them the disposition to establish schools of their church? We indicated in the December article some of the difficulties which stand in the way of realizing the avowed policy in respect to schools, and at this point the "Herald of Faith" betrays most anxiety. The anxiety appears in several ways. On our observation that it is one thing to promulgate a decree and another thing to carry it into effect, the writer remarks, "The writer apparently knows about the parochial school decree of the third plenary council and the frequent non-observance of the same in the Northeast." On our observation that for such a purpose the Catholic leaders find it difficult, if not impossible, to secure the necessary support, the editor remarks that the "writer evidently does not know the enthusiasm for parochial schools which exists among German Catholics." We had said that neither ecclesiastical decrees nor zealous priests are able to create schoolhouses, to which the editor replies that "the energetic but not yet secularized (*vulgo* Americanized) Christian disposition of the people will create them." Our doubt about the pecuniary ability of Irish Catholics to support a sufficient number of schools is met by the statement of the editor that "it is not true, provided superfine theatre music does not swallow up the money, or the aspiring prominence of the preacher make unreasonable demands, as, for example, two thousand dollars for pew cushions." In view of our question whether an intelligent Irishman is willing to be taxed twice for the same thing, the writer exclaims, presumably of such a sentiment, "foul fish from eastern waters."

But it is concerning our statement that the growth of parochial schools is hindered by the superiority of the public schools that the editor waxes most earnest. What if they are superior, he seems to say; intelligence without religion does more harm than good. "Those parents must indeed be already secularized (*vulgo* Americanized) who prefer a worldly smartness to a sound, godly, Christian education. If Satan, who was formerly called Lucifer, should establish a school to-day, he would doubtless be a most acute and smart schoolmaster, for the devil certainly is not stupid, but exceedingly clever; but, nevertheless, a Catholic father must keep his children away from such a school, and, instead, give them, in an unpretending but all the more solid parochial school, an education with its direction towards God." The writer admits that many young Catholics who have themselves been graduated from public schools wish to have their children educated in the same schools, and cites the case of the Paulists in New York who have failed to draw children into parochial schools. "In every case," the writer remarks, "the opposition counts on the rapid, many-sided secularization (that is, Americanizing) of our Catholic people, in order thereby to carry forward more rapidly its

warfare against the church of God. The public school is always represented as an American institution in contrast with our *foreign* parochial schools."

These comments of a Catholic writer confirm us in the opinion expressed in the article under discussion, that at present the attempt should be made to keep the Roman Catholic laity in sympathy with our public schools. Violent opposition has a tendency to solidify them in defense of their church and its measures. Nothing should be permitted in the schools which would needlessly alienate Catholics. School boards and school management should not be made distinctly anti-Catholic. Romanism should not be made an issue in municipal politics. The schools should be made more practical as preparatory for the every-day work of life. It may in the future become a question whether morality and religion should not have a larger place than at present in public schools. But, as things now are, the wise as well as the moral policy is to put Catholics at no disadvantage in the use and management of schools, and to avoid measures which tend to solidify the Catholic population. It should, in a good sense, be our aim to Americanize, not to antagonize, Irish, German, and French Catholics, and for this purpose no agency is more effective than coeducation in public schools. The writer we have quoted, in concluding his article, refers to the opinion of Archbishop Heiss, who says that the school question is the living question of the Church in America, and he had already emphasized the remark of another bishop who declared that he who does not value his holy faith as the highest thing in the world does not value it at all. Concerning the plans of the clergy there is no doubt, but of their ability to bend the whole church to their wish we entertain much doubt.

THE SALARIES OF MINISTERS.

ARCHDEACON MACKAY-SMITH, in his article in *Harper's* for January on "The Clergy and the Times," took occasion to discuss at some length the question of ministerial supply. "There is at present," he said, "a somewhat alarming lack of candidates throughout the country. Both quantity and quality are said to justify anxiety. As it is known, or at least believed, that no such *questio vexata* is harassing the churches of Great Britain to anything like the same extent, inferences unfavorable both to depth of religious life and fervor of religious faith among men in America have been drawn. But it is questionable whether such reasoning is based on substantial fact. The truth seems to be, that, owing to the era of national development which has followed our late civil war — a development by which opportunities for adventure and enterprise, the gaining of wealth and the attainment of high social and political advancement, have been a thousandfold multiplied — the spiritual nature of our American youth inclining toward the ministry has been exposed to a tremendous strain. The varied occupations of what is called 'business'

offer to a young man here greater chances and more dazzling prizes than elsewhere in the world."

The New York "Times," in commenting editorially on this explanation, says : —

"We cannot at all assent to the explanation offered. It is the simple one which has always been given, and which, we believe, was never so baseless as now — the assertion, namely, that the prospect of a good income is so much poorer in the ministry than in other professions or in business that young men cannot bring themselves to the great self-sacrifice, from the money point of view, of studying for the ministry.

"Now, the archdeacon himself practically admits that the young minister has the best of his contemporaries in other professions at the start, for he wishes that a rule could be made that young men in the ministry should not be allowed to marry until after being at work for five years, as, he says, is practically the case in other professions. Of course it is, and of course the reason why the sacrament of matrimony usually follows so quickly upon that of ordination is that the young minister becomes at once sure of an income which the young lawyer or doctor, not to speak of journalists, has to work up to during a long period. Nor is this at all new. Dr. Holmes in his famous class poem, describing the horse-race of life, depicts the minister shooting rapidly ahead at the start and leading all his competitors at the quarter pole. This is undoubtedly the case still. We could point to a half dozen prominent ministers, scarcely a dozen years out of college, who are already in charge of large churches, receiving fine salaries, and trying not to smile when they are addressed as Doctors of Divinity. There is nothing like it in any other profession. If it is purely a question of the shortest and easiest way to a large income, the choice of a young man of ability should by all odds lead him to the ministry.

"And if the question is made one of the long run, and of provision for old age, it need only be said that equal prudence and economy would make the lot of the average minister more desirable, from even a financial point of view, than the lot of the average lawyer, far better than that of the average doctor, this quite apart from the established system of pensions for aged or disabled ministers, a thing unknown in the other professions. And certainly the recorded percentage of failures in business life do not tend to lower the comparative worldly advantages of the ministry, even admitting the occasional winning of a corruptible crown such as a clergyman is not supposed to strive for. We have heard a business man who is an active Christian and church-member characterize as 'nonsense' the talk he had to listen to from his own pastor and that is current in the religious press about the great pecuniary sacrifices of the ministry. He was willing to give to needy ministers, he said, but let the thing be put upon the ground of misfortune or improvidence, not upon the necessities of the profession."

We confess to very much less fear for the ministry from the present lack of candidates — unless it be for missionary service, particularly in the New West — than from the overcrowding of the profession which is sure to come when the material conditions, of which Archdeacon Mackay-Smith writes, are changed. Whenever the time comes, which he predicts as not far distant, when "the land will all have been taken up, the

chances for sudden fortunes lessened, the emigration shrunken to a 'thread-like stream,' the population become tolerably homogeneous, the channels of trade marked and bounded," then young men will be apt to turn in larger numbers to the ministry for a livelihood, as has been the case in other and older countries, and, it is to be feared, with the same moral results to the ministry. At present the moral quality of the ministry in this country is better for the "tremendous strain" to which "the spiritual nature of our American youth inclining toward the ministry has been exposed." But, apart from the question of the material influence which may be supposed to affect the supply of ministers, we believe it to be a fact, as claimed by the "Times," that the minister of the average well-to-do parish is not underpaid by comparison with the *salaried* persons of other professions. The distinction of a salaried position is that it removes the one who fills it from the opportunities, as well as from the most urgent necessities, of money-making. It is usually a place of trust or of honor, and as such it invites. A lawyer in good practice takes a seat upon the bench at a pecuniary loss, but there are compensating reasons for the change. The young man who enters the ministry foregoes money-making for other and higher ends, but there are the same pecuniary possibilities, the same material results before him as before a young man who enters any profession for professional rather than for "business" purposes. The salaries of ministers in the larger parishes equal, where they do not exceed, the salaries of justices of the supreme courts of the States, and of the United States. The salaries of ministers in that very large field of secondary parishes equal, if they do not exceed, the salaries of professors in the larger colleges. The salary of the average country minister (we do not refer now to the home missionary of the East or the West) equals the income of the average country doctor, making suitable allowance in the case of the latter for uncollectible charges. We agree, therefore, with the protest of the "Times" against the constant references, in one way or another, to the question of ministerial support. All such references invite comparisons which do not sustain the complaints urged. There are exceptions, exceptions which tell the story of great sacrifices and grievous hardships. But they belong chiefly to the missionary branch of the service, always remembering that there are missionaries who do not bear that name, and are not so classified in the year-book of the denomination. And there are in the ministry, perhaps to a peculiar degree, because of the temperament and work of those who engage in that calling, a considerable number of exceptional cases involving no little suffering and poverty. But the social condition of the ministry at large we do not believe to be such as to call for special discussion, or to offer any barrier to a young man who really sees the opportunity for influence which it affords.

There are, however, two or three facts which ought to be mentioned in estimating the pecuniary situation of the ministry. One is the effect of the comparatively large income at the beginning of one's ministerial

career in forming personal tastes and in determining the rate of expenditure. Of four young men, of equal ability, and without fortune, who enter respectively the professions of law, medicine, journalism, and the ministry, it may be expected, with hardly a doubt, that at the end of the first five years of professional service the minister will be in the best social position. His home will be better furnished than theirs, allowing that they have been able to marry, he will have a better library, he will show more of the general equipment of social and professional life. Something of this outlay may be compulsory. A minister's salary is pretty carefully graduated to the standard at which he is expected to live in the community. The margin for laying up money is never intended to be large. But it is one result of this amount of income at the beginning that tastes are developed which it is difficult afterward to restrain or to satisfy. On the other hand, the narrower income of the earlier years of the other professions trains men to more moderate tastes and to more careful habits of expenditure, so that at the end of twenty years the margin of actual savings is greatly in excess of that of the ministry for the same time, even at the same aggregate income.

Another fact is the frequency in change of location by the average minister. We have said that the annual income of the country doctor is no greater than that of the country minister, but the doctor has the advantage of permanence. He gains by simple accumulation. The minister loses something by every change. Even where the change may seem to be for the betterment of his social condition, it involves a certain amount of loss through the necessity of adjustment to new surroundings.

Perhaps the most serious fact is the decline in earning power after a comparatively early date in the working life of a minister. The minister passes his professional prime at least ten years in advance of his peers in the other professions. The exceptions to this fact prove it. And we know of no sufficient remedy. For preaching involves the expenditure, to a degree which tells upon the whole system, of nervous vitality. A preacher's spiritual insight may be on the increase, and his knowledge of truth and of men, and he may show increasing vitality of style, but the power of communicating truth, the power of projecting one's personality, begins to wane when the nervous energies are depleted. The old age of a preacher seldom represents the same professional availability as that of a lawyer or doctor. He must lay up for old age. Their old age is comparatively productive. "The established system of pensions for aged and disabled ministers" is, as yet, a very small affair in the cases which it may cover, and it will never apply with any force to the average minister. No profession seems to demand more forethought than that of the ministry, but none offers so little discipline and training toward it at the time when the minister begins his professional work.

"THE PROBLEM OF THE COUNTRY CHURCH,"—A COMMUNICATION.

QUITE a number of "comments" on the problem of the country church reached us too late for insertion in the number of the *REVIEW* following the discussion of the subject by the Rev. Mr. Tunis. We regret that we have been unable to find room for them in later numbers. A comment, or criticism, has just come to hand, which we insert because it illustrates in detail what may be done in the smaller communities where increase of pastoral force is impossible. The writer of the following note is the Rev. William Sewall, of Charlton, Mass., and we suspect that the illustration given is from his own experience.

"The writer of this note is in hearty sympathy with the purpose and spirit of Mr. Tunis in his article in the *ANDOVER REVIEW*, September, 1888, and is in accord with some of his suggestions. But the details of his proposed work seem impracticable in the average country church. He virtually admits this when he says (p. 231): 'Unquestionably the work of the country church cannot be really taken in hand without an assistant minister. Services must be held often, daily if possible, to get soonest good results, and the active work and parish visiting demand two men. They should both be well supported in order to afford the means of studying the work as it requires. They should be able to get away once a week for entire change of mind and renewal of spirit. They must visit other parishes, have books, be able to set examples of generosity.' Again he says: 'The great need is a thoroughly capable and efficient minister, and if he could be induced to take such a charge, he could not have a maintenance sufficient to keep him qualified.'

"All this is most desirable but, of course, practically impossible, in the case supposed.

"He finds the remedy in the country church's self-endowment. Even if this were always or often possible, it must be conceded to be of questionable benefit, judging from the history of some churches where it has been tried. Some methods must be employed which can be used without increased expenditure.

"The following illustration is given for its bearing upon pastoral work as it may be carried on without increase of force in neglected districts and neighborhoods:—

"A pastor came to a small parish. (The resident church-membership was less than fifty.) The surrounding influence was decidedly unevangelical. He spent a year and more in such work as naturally came to his hand at the centre, meanwhile reconnoitring the field outside. Finally he fixed upon a district two miles from the church. There was a fine schoolhouse and a goodly number of families around it. Meetings had been occasionally held there, now by evangelical pastors and again by others. Of these families three were habitually represented at the centre church and in its membership; two other families were also more or less regular attendants at evangelical churches in other directions. The larger number remaining were at this time non-church-goers, although some had formerly been attendants. These now practically had no Sabbath and showed no regard for sacred things. Their children were following in their steps.

"In due time the pastor conferred with his own families in the district about having occasional religious services. They were ready to welcome such

services heartily, but could give no encouragement as to the attendance of many others. After earnest prayer by the pastor and by those in sympathy with him, the first meeting was held. It was in the fall, the last day of September, a moonlight week evening. To the surprise of many, twenty were present. At their desire another meeting was appointed. More came than were at the first. By request the meetings were continued, with increasing numbers, varying with circumstances, but settling to a steady average of about thirty-three, divided pretty equally between children and adults. As to the plan of the meetings, they were kept exactly within one hour. At first, the pastor occupied the time opening and closing with prayer, and giving familiar scriptural talks on practical Christian living. For example: 'How to read the Bible:' (1) daily; (2) early in the day; (3) prayerfully; (4) thoughtfully; (5) recognizing Jesus Christ as its central character, as Redeemer, Saviour, and King; (6) obediently. 'God's revelation in his works and Word,' Psalm xix. 'The faithful saying,' 1 Tim. i. 15. A talk to the children, Prov. xx. 11. There was responsive reading of a psalm and, very soon, 'reading around' by all who chose to do so, of the Scripture lesson which was always assigned the previous evening. Nearly all chose to take part. Every exercise was voluntary: no one who did not wish to take part was asked to. A brief review, questioning by the pastor on the lesson and talk of the preceding evening, always met with a prompt response. The pastor took Bibles and Testaments to supply any who wished for them. These books he gave or sold or loaned, as seemed best, leaving a few copies in the schoolhouse for general use, and as an inducement to take up and read at any time.

"The next addition to the programme was the assigning of Scripture topics upon which to bring passages. Many were brought. As these were repeated or read, one after another, the pastor commented on each by way of fastening and applying the truth as it illustrated the topic of the meeting. This exercise was interspersed with singing and voluntary prayers and occupied the hour. Next was introduced the profitable service of 'sentence prayers.' All bowing the head, they who were so moved offered, one after another, a single petition or more, either in their own words or in Scripture language. Many easily and naturally fell into this, the younger as well as the older. It served to bring out the thoughts and feelings which were moving different persons. It promoted oneness of spirit, and it unconsciously helped beginners in a religious life to make a committal of themselves, and to hear their own voices in prayer. They did this very informally, simply speaking a few words to the Master, as they felt their need.

"Sacred song was, of course, made a specialty in these meetings. (Gospel Hymns No. 5 was adopted by the meeting.) The pastor called attention to the sentiment of the words as well as to their correct and natural rendering in singing, so that the exercise became significant and spiritually effective.

"These meetings were on week evenings in winter and on Sabbath afternoons (four o'clock) in summer, as this arrangement seemed best to the district. Meanwhile the pastor and his wife called on the families, being always cordially welcomed. The families visited apparently enjoyed the reading of the Word and prayer.

"At the close of a year's series of meetings (interrupted during a portion of the winter when the weather was unfavorable) an Ebenezer meeting was held. These were its prominent features: 1. Each one who so desired was asked to name, so far as remembered, the topics of the year. 2. To give a

brief answer to the question, 'What have I gained from these meetings?'

3. To come prepared to offer a sentence-prayer of thanksgiving, confession, or request, in his or her own language or in the words of the Bible. The meeting was largely attended, and nearly all present readily and happily responded.

"An earnest desire was also expressed for the continuance of the meetings. They are still held with steady interest. Even during the pastor's vacation, at the request of the meeting, a deacon of the church took his place in leading the service with no perceptible failure in attendance or interest.

"Two incidents may be given as indicating the cordial feeling of the people and their willingness to do their part toward sustaining the meetings.

"On one occasion they invited themselves to a basket-picnic at the pastor's home, taking tea, and spending an evening socially. Nearly every family was represented. 'Young men and maidens, old men and children,' came together as one happy household. The evening's entertainment ended with words of grateful greeting by the pastor, singing, and fervent prayer, led by a former pastor, who with his estimable wife is passing a serene and happy old age among his former people, beloved and revered.

"The other incident (entirely unexpected by the pastor) formed an item of the Ebenezer Meeting. Just at its close a lady came forward, and in a few appropriate words kindly thanked him, in behalf of the district, for his work among them, and handed him an envelope containing a free-will offering of money for defraying his expenses and as a token of their grateful appreciation of his services.

"It is not time to speak with confidence of decided and permanent results. The work has not been tested; indeed, it is still in its beginning. Yet it is only right to mention, to the praise of God, some things which certainly point to fruitage and are most valuable in themselves so far as they go.

"(1.) Interest in reading the Bible. The school-children were talking about their verses, at recess and at noon-time, and helping each other to select one for the meeting, and asking their teacher to help them, as well as their parents at home.

"The teacher (whose influence and sympathy furnished constant encouragement and assistance) assigned the Scripture lesson of the meeting as the chapter to be carefully read each morning of the week previous at school. Some of the older people, not Bible-readers, were constant and interested listeners as it was read and explained by the pastor, not hesitating to express their new interest.

"Bibles and Testaments came to be wanted in the families.

"(2.) A desire to go to church on the Sabbath was awakened. Occasional attendants became regular. Non-attendants began to attend occasionally. Those who were unable to be regular church-goers, by reason of distance and lack of conveyance, now gladly availed themselves of any opportunity that occurred and sought opportunities.

"(3.) Curiosity and inquiry about the meetings began to be awakened in neighboring districts and in other parts of the town. The people at the centre became interested and attended and took part in the services, increasing thereby their spiritual power as Christians.

"(4.) Religious interest was naturally and easily awakened in the young. There was stirring of thought and feeling about religious duty on their part, and some made a decided committal to Christ, while a readiness was acquired in taking intelligent part in religious services."

ARCHÆOLOGICAL NOTES.

WE associate Shamanism with the Eastern Continent. Dr. Washington Matthews has made it easier to locate the system in the West. In the "American Anthropologist" of April, 1888, he has rendered "the Prayer of a Navajo Shaman." There is a weird rhythm in the black-wand and the blue-wand of the way-opener. The reader journeys as under a spell through the chambers of the cloud and past the doors guarded by Red Bear and great Red Serpent. Now the trail leads to the lodge of the deceased — through fields beautified, as when he lived, by the yellow corn. The Spirit enters and sits down on the floor. Then he exults. "My feet are restored to me, my limbs are restored to me, my mind, the dust of my feet, my saliva, my hair." A choral outburst succeeds. Beauty, ineffable beauty is in the restored world to the vision of the soul now no longer absent from the body.

The parallel with Egypt is obvious. Dr. Peet has suggested another in a recent remarkable paper on the "Pyramid in America." Not every one is accustomed to the thought that America is the home of the pyramid. Yet it exists in types and localities the most various. It is mound, platform, terrace, palace, and perfect pyramid in turn. The first is the germ of the last. The different earthworks in the Mississippi valley show the stages through which the Mexican pyramid passed on its way to completion. Utility was one object. Worship was another. The prehistoric structures in this country were meant for religious structures and embodied the builders' awe and fear with a simplicity and sublimity scarcely less impressive than Cheops' mountain of stone. "The great mound at St. Louis contained a burial chamber 75 feet long, 12 feet wide, 8 feet high, and several bodies were contained in it, which were covered with beads and other paraphernalia of royalty." The prototype of this was the Pyramids of Egypt as tombs. The teocalles of Mexico were terraced pyramids devoted to the glory of the Sun. Corresponding to these were the terraced Ziggurat of Chaldæa as Temples.

Mexico and Central America are neighbors. The latter brings to mind perhaps Dr. Le Plongeon's curious theory of the Egyptian Sphinx. Moo the Queen of Mayax erected a mausoleum over her murdered husband Coh, placing on the top his totem — a leopard with a human head. The murderer forced her to migrate Eastward. Does she reach the Nile and Moo become Mau or Isis? Was it she, who to perpetuate her husband's memory (Osir the beloved, hence Osir) caused the Sphinx to be sculptured to the semblance of the leopard with human head placed on the top of his tomb? Did she intrust her son Hul with the erection of the huge statue that for this reason was named Hu in the text? Dr. Plongeon apparently inclines to say yes and hopes others may do the same! The more so as the title of the Sphinx, Hormakkhu, is, according to the Maya language, a word made up of three primitives — *Hool-ma-ku*, that is, Leader-Mayax-God, or the God-chief in Mayax! As in Egypt, so at Chichen there are three principal pyramids a short distance apart, and the Sphinx, as well as Prince Coh's mausoleum with his totem, is placed in front of the second of these monuments in the respective countries!

It steadies a brain somewhat dizzy over such an hypothesis to read Dr. Brinton's note on an Ancient Human Footprint from Nicaragua. He

gives the dimensions with mathematical precision. "The total length of the impression is $9\frac{1}{2}$ inches, the breadth at the heel 3 inches, at the toes $4\frac{1}{2}$ inches. The apparent length of the foot itself was 8 inches." The great toe was large, prominent, and exceeding in length the second toe. Where the ball of the foot strikes the ground the maximal depression is 2 inches below the plane of the figured superficies. That the footprints are undoubtedly human is shown by a solid mass of facts. Dr. Brinton does not see in them all proof enough to date the Primeval Man beyond the present Post-pliocene or Quaternary period.

Dr. G. F. Wright, of Oberlin, will be remembered for a brilliant course of Lectures at the Lowell Institute of Boston on Glaciers. These are to be published it is expected within a year. The December number of the "Popular Science Monthly" refers to him on the question of Interglacial Man in Ohio. Palæolithic flints were found three years ago by Dr. Metz at Madisonville and Loveland. "The sites of these discoveries have been carefully examined by Rev. G. F. Wright, who, taking the whole configuration and geological character of the region with its peculiar formations into account, pronounces the beds to be unquestionably virgin glacial deposits in sites where there can have been no subsequent deposition." In Ohio as well as on the Atlantic coast man was then an inhabitant before the close of the glacial period.

For scientific enthusiasm and ethnographical eminence Mr. Frank H. Cushing has long been without a peer. Thanks to the Hemenway Expedition of the past year, he has won laurels in archæology no less. He has found in Arizona a City of the Dead. Its communal houses, its priestly bodies once wrapped in cotton, its adobe sarcophagi with hieroglyphs, may throw a flood of light on the ancestors of the living Zunis. It is conjectured that some terra-cotta figures of the fox, the coyote, and the deer may have been substituted by the aboriginal herdsmen for the animals themselves in sacrifice. This unknown race built along irrigating canals. Their tools were stone, their ornaments copper.

A lady who has cultivated the Zunis with hardly less devotion than Mr. Cushing is Mrs. T. E. Stevenson. With much that was more profound she pictured to the Woman's Anthropological Society last March the Indian conjurer. "One of their tricks is for two persons to draw a rope to and fro across the body of another until it appears on the opposite side. Another is to pass two breast-feathers of the eagle through the flame of a lamp bringing out two charred bits, and, after manipulating for a time, pressing the bits to their nude breasts and reproducing the feathers in all their original beauty."

More interesting because more vital is the question asked and answered before the Victoria Institute. "Was there any historic connection between the aboriginal religions of America and the teaching of the Bible?" The common view of American ethnologists favors the autochthonous origin of everything native American. The writer of the paper published in the Transactions, vol. xxi, No. 84, 1888, brings forward three lines of evidence pointing the other way. (1.) American symbols reminding of those in the Bible. Such are the Cross, the Serpent, the Tree, the Ark, the Cloven Tongue, the Towers like Babel. (2.) There is a marked analogy between certain customs in America and in the Bible. For example, think of Circumcision and Baptism. (3.) Many traditions of the Western Continent recall the Biblical ones. Not to name others, there are American traditions of Creation, of the Flood,

of the Dispersion of the Race, of the Incest like that of Lot and his daughters. The position taken is cautious, tentative yet hopeful. "We do not say that they are the same traditions or that the American tribes derived their ideas from the Bible or even from any one who was familiar with the Bible. We only say that these events are recorded in the native traditions of America and in Bible history." "The fashion is to explain away all these resemblances to Bible stories, but they seem to be accumulating more and more; and it is among the possibilities that by and by the evidence will be so overwhelming that it will convince the most skeptical."

The American Oriental Society has held one of the most memorable meetings in its history of almost half a century. This was October 31. in Philadelphia. In the chapel of the University of Pennsylvania, during the first session, appropriate notice was taken of Rev. Dr. Elijah P. Barrows's decease, whose great erudition and winning character had placed him high on the roll of the Society's members. Professor Lyon of Harvard, the Recording Secretary, in a compact sketch of the Society, gave special praise to Professors Salisbury, Van-Name, and Whitney of Yale, and to Dr. Ezra Abbot of Harvard, for eminent service. The Semitic interest was at white heat in the majority of the forty-three communications accepted. One reason of this was without doubt the Expedition to Babylonia, of which Dr. Peters is director and Professor Hilprecht a member, recently sent out from Philadelphia. Dr. Pepper, Provost of the University, fanned the flame by his reception to the Society, by the eloquent addresses from Dr. Ward, Professor Harper of Yale, Dr. Francis Brown of Union Theological Seminary, and by the exquisite cylinder of Nebuchadnezzar and vase containing the name of Xerxes on exhibition in his hospitable home. Two other influences among many pointed the same way. The first was the reported discovery of the Dimensions of the Babylonian Ark. These were 600 cubits in length, 120 in breadth, and 120 in height. Professor Paul Haupt of Johns Hopkins University made them out for the first time from a tablet in the British Museum the past summer, and explained them on the black-board with great distinctness. The other influence was the appointment of a Committee, consisting of Drs. Hall and Gottheil of New York, Professor Moore of Andover, Dr. Adler of Baltimore, and Professor Hopkins of Bryn Mawr, to locate and to catalogue the Oriental MSS. in America. In the "Independent" of November 15th will be found Professor Lyon's excellent report. All will join with him in the wish that the Philadelphia Expedition temporarily interrupted may "be the fortunate discoverers of the libraries of Nebuchadnezzar and Cyrus, and thus throw light on the important events connected with the deportation and liberation of the Jews."

Egypt might seem slighted in the programme. On the contrary, Professor Moore presented an account of a Samaritan MS. given by Dr. Grant Bey, and Dr. I. Hall read passages from a letter, describing the loss by fire and theft of the same generous gentleman's prized Egyptian collection. Dr. Toy's learned paper on the Arabic dialect of Cairo was a living proof of the close connection between the land of the Pharaohs and the Orient. Dr. Adler reported for the "National Museum Exhibit of Eastern Antiquities" objects, photographs, and casts of Egyptian as well as Babylonian, Syrian, and Arabic treasures. This was at the Cincinnati Exposition. Professor Paul Haupt emphasized, with a national

society of Biblical Archæology, the need, semitically speaking, of an Egypt-Exploration-Fund, which should be American, not English.

Are Foreign Missions a failure? Not while they are represented by men of the stamp of President Martin, of Peking, whose communication to the Oriental Society showed that Plato and Confucius agreed in a negative answer to the question, May a son act as public prosecutor to a parent?

Nor while they can furnish to numismatologists articles so readable as Rev. Mr. Ament, of China, published in the September number of the "*American Journal of Archæology*," on the ancient coinage of China. "Chinese coins have always been cast, not struck." The first inscriptions were names of articles of traffic, that is, "Hempen Cloth," "Precious Stones," "Metal," "Sword and Knife." Next came symbolic figures. Such were the Dragon, the Tortoise, and the Horse. The latter is an emblem of the earth. Ching Wang, twenty-fifth emperor of the Chou dynasty, 544 B. C., was the first who coined round money with inscriptions. This is perhaps a trifle earlier than the Phœnician Stater of Hali-carnassus, marked in the "Coins of the Ancients" by Mr. Head of the British Museum as the earliest inscribed coin known, and which reads "I am Phanes" in retrograde archaic characters. At all events, the Chinese were the earliest *writers* on coins, Kuan Tzu dating 645 B. C. The favorite shape for money in China was and is the round flat coin with a square hole in the centre. After the earliest inscription, Huo-Pu, "merchandise," and "cloth," on a piece shaped like a bale, came, in order, inscriptions indicating weight, issue, city. In the present dynasty, 1644 A. D., on the obverse are Chinese characters, usually four in number, representing the name of the epoch (nien Hao), and the words meaning "heavy," "universal," "large currency." Coins are found in ruins, in graves, and, instead of under the corner-stone as in America, in the wall under the roof of imperial buildings. They are used for charms and even ground to powder for medicine. Among the curious specimens figured on the plates of the journal are Goose-eye money and Constellation money. The latter has seven stars, united like the floats of a net, a tortoise and sword in the field. They stand for Ursa Major. Extremely interesting are the prayer-coins, seeking for the state peace; for the individual long life, wealth, and honor; for parents five sons and two daughters, the ideal Chinese family!

The past year Paris has been enriched by a building and a collection, of which M. Guimet, a savant, traveler, and a millionaire, long a resident of China and Japan, is the originator. His object is to teach the history of Oriental religions in their evolution and nature. The pottery of both countries is set up in geographical and historical order. The library contains 12,000 volumes of Oriental mythology and theology. In the hall of Japanese religion one begins with the round metal mirrors of the Shinto worship, resting on waves of carved wood, and once reflecting the beams of the rising sun. Then come the Shintoists' simple, and the Buddhists' elaborate priesthood. In the centre of the hall is a perfect reproduction of a Japanese temple. There, to the popular eye, appear the four agencies of love, a quartette of four golden prophets robed in silk; and there, too, equally the four agencies of fear, a quartette of black demons with gnashing teeth. Both are sent out by the compassionate Buddha to save men. The cases beyond enshrine hundreds of objects, introducing the novice to sacred persons and places of Nipon, with the fascination of fairy land and the realism of a mediæval chronicle.

What this beautiful structure in the Avenue d'Jéna does for the eye, the University of Berlin is doing for the tongue of Oriental students. Courses were provided the past year at the Seminar für Orientalische Sprachen, of highest practical value to the prospective resident of these countries. Was Japan to be one's home. He would not merely hear a popular lecture from Dr. Inoué on the national religion. The same accomplished gentleman lectured two hours a week on Japanese history, and gave eight hours a week to Japanese conversation. In the same way Professor Arendt devoted two hours a week to Chinese conversation and business style, while Messrs. Lin and Sching spoke eight hours a week respectively with students wishing to know the Northern or Southern dialect.

A like thoroughness marks the work of the year of the Deutschen Palestina-Vereins. We would call attention to Dr. Leo Anderlind's continued and elaborate observations on the fruit-trees of the Holy Land. The olive-tree he deems indigenous in Syria rather than in Egypt, Greece, or Italy, where the tree-trunks do not attain extraordinary thickness. That the gnarled ancients of Gethsemane were witnesses to the agony of our Lord is utterly improbable. Josephus, who saw the light at Jerusalem thirty-seven years after the birth of Christ, states that Titus at the siege of Jerusalem, 70 A. D., felled all the trees around the city to a distance of one hundred stadia. On the other hand, olive-trees were found in the garden of Gethsemane 636 A. D., at the time of the capture of Jerusalem by the Saracens. This is, of course, no indisputable evidence that the present olive-trees are of Saracenic date. They may be the descendants of the others. The palm is an ornamental tree rather than a fruit-tree in Syria. Robinson in 1838 found one in Jericho. To-day even that is gone. Single palms or groups may be seen in Gaza, Jaffa, Nazareth, Tiberias, — eight even in Jerusalem. Orthodox Jews in Palestina carry the branches at the Feast of Tabernacles.

The discovery of the Pool of Bethesda was announced in the July number of the "Palestine Exploration Fund." It is located some one hundred feet northwest of St. Anne's church, or Salahieh. In length from east to west it is fifty-five feet, a cistern cut in the solid rock to the depth of thirty feet. The north wall has four piers. Now they are filled in. Once they are thought to have extended in five arcades. Here was certainly the site of the mediæval Pool of Bethesda, which Sir Charles Wilson has marked at this very point on his diagram. About 1230 the Birket Israel usurped its place and name. The history of the newly found Pool can be traced to 333 A. D., the date of the Bordeaux Pilgrim. Whether it is the Pool of John v. 2 cannot be determined positively. The Fountain of the Virgin still possesses one superior qualification in the troubling of the water. We are pleased that Herr Shick, the discoverer, should at once have made exact and intelligible plans.

As to the Sidon Sarcophagi, they are in the museum at Constantinople, awaiting publication by the ambitious Hamdi Bey. Professor Hayter Lewis thinks the sculptures of one represent in all probability a battle between Darius and Alexander. Captain Conder illustrates the horse led in procession by the horses in Etruscan tombs, and those sacrificed in India, which were only less precious than man.

Apropos of India, the "Quarterly Asiatic Review" for October furnishes an article of special archæological significance on the Mahratta Plough. According to it the ordinary plough of these patriotic and pious

farmers is made up of six parts. (1.) The *dant*, which is the dentale or dentalia of the Romans, and the *δενμα* of the Greeks. This is the body of the plough, or share-beam, of babul wood [*acacia arabica*]. (2.) The *phal*, which is the Roman vomis and Greek *ὑνις*. This is the spade-shaped iron share fastened to the share-beam by its long handle [*phala*] and a triangular iron girdle called *wasu*. The Roman spade was called "pala." (3.) The *ruman*, corresponding to the Roman "buris" and the Greek *γῆς*, which was the upright stilt or plough-tail fastened into the broad end of the plough beam. (4.) The *muliah*, which is the "stiva" and "manicula" of the Romans, the *ἐχέλη* of the Greeks. This is the cross-handle passed through the top of the Ruman and enabling the ploughman to hold and to guide it. (5.) The *alus*, Roman "temo," Greek *ῥῆμα* (recall Ruman), is the pole or plough-tree by which the plough was drawn. (6.) The *juh* is the same as the jugum of the Romans and the *ζυγόν* of the Greeks, that is, the yoke for the oxen drawing the plough.

It is well known that the Buddhists built wooden halls of assembly with barrel-roofs. The Chaitya caves are supposed to hand down the pictures of such halls. From Ceylon to the Hindu Cush the circular gable may be found entering into sacred ornamentation. Why did the early inhabitants of Hindostan construct this peculiar roof? Mr. William Simpson, M. R. A. S., thinks the Toda hut supplies the explanation. The flexible bamboo was bent and long grass spread over it as shelter from sun and rain. In this primitive habitation was the germ of the Chaitya Hall. Fergusson, in his "History of India" and Eastern Architecture, had suggested the same possibility.

"An Indian Tale on its Travels" is what Herr Varnhagen has termed the mediæval legend of King Jovinien. For his pride the monarch loses his throne. On wishing to dress after bathing he can neither find his garments nor establish his identity at court. He is driven from the palace as an impostor. Only when he confesses his sins to a hermit is the false king made known as an angel sent from heaven to humble Jovinien's pride. Israel Levi has shown that the substitution in the Indian tale is of a different character from this, a veritable avatar. The starting point of the legend of the Middle Ages was not the Ganges, but the Jordan. Originating among the Jews, it circulated among the Arabs, and then among the Byzantines. To be sure, the Talmud of Babylon makes a demon Solomon's supplanter. But the Talmud of Jerusalem says, after Solomon's three sins God said, "descend from thy throne." Then came an angel who took the form of Solomon and sat in his place. Solomon went from door to door saying, "I the Preacher was king over Israel in Jerusalem."

The interchange of letters between Egypt and Mesopotamia, and the wide prevalence of the Babylonian script where we might have expected the Phœnician, are two results of the remarkable Tel-el-Amarna find of last winter on the Nile.

The site was that of the great heretic or great reformer, Khunaten's new capital, which succeeded and rivalled Thebes. The tablets were in part from a prince named Tushratta, from the land of Mitanni, famous for its lions, to the mighty hunter Amenhotep III. of Egypt, who won a fairer quarry in his bride Thi. This Mesopotamian marriage had, in the view of some scholars, marked consequences: It produced an influx of Semitic phrases and fashions, and paved the way for Khunaten's

Monotheistic reforms. The addresses of the letters are ceremonious, as though written by a Chinese. One is a romantic suit for the hand of an Egyptian princess for a young nephew, backed by the offer of a speedy and heavy shipment of gold. The large flat unbaked tablets were in part official reports of provincial governors from Palestine to the Egyptian monarch, whose conquests were on a par with Thothmes III., and whose features are preserved in the famous Memnon of Thebes. That Amenhotep was rich appears from his working the mines of Nubia. That he was beloved seems clear from the taxes paid by his subjects beyond the assessment in the holy thirtieth year.

It is the same Amenophis or Amenhotep III. of the XVIII dynasty, whose cartouche has been discovered the past year at Bubastis (Tel-Basta) by M. Naville. Hitherto the traces of this powerful house had been sought in vain in the Delta. Now, where Mariette had given up in despair, inscriptions of the VI, the XII, and the XVIII dynasties have rewarded research. Out of the crater of an extinct volcano, so to speak, have emerged the remains of a great temple, with its Festival Hall of the very monarch identified with Zerah, the Ethiopian, of Chronicles. The statue of King Raian or Chian we merely name. A superb head of the Goddess Hathor, "who from her dark womb brought the bright sun," was a surer spoil. Finer yet, if possible, were two magnificent Hyksos sphinxes of colossal size, proving once again that the Hyksos of reality were by no means the same pillagers of temples with the Hyksos of romance.

While Naville has been doing great things in the Delta, Petrie has not been idle in the Fayoum. He has located Herodotus' Labyrinth south of the Hawara pyramid, and reconstructed Herodotus' colossi of Lake Moeris, which, on pedestals approached by a sloping wall, would wear the aspect of standing on a pyramid themselves. This indefatigable excavator has well-nigh pierced the Pyramid Tomb of Amenemhat III., and is hoping the present season to reach the intact mummy of this illustrious Pharaoh of the XII dynasty.

Incidentally, as it were, he has unearthed at the necropolis of Hawara some sixty portraits of Roman times. These were mostly on cedar panels. They appear to have succeeded the gilt cartonnage mask of the mummies of the second century of our era. The subjects were in majority middle-aged men and young women. Only some half a dozen were pronounced Shemites in physiognomy. A special largeness of the eye characterized the group, which was, as a whole, of superior beauty. The artists were always clever, sometimes masterly in drawing, in color, and in expression.

"Ancient Rome in the light of modern discoveries" has however been given to us of late by Rodolfo Lanciani himself. One paragraph of his sums up the unprecedented archæological gains of little more than a decade. "We have discovered," he says, "a new archæological stratum totally unknown before, the stratum of prehistoric or traditional antiquities; we have discovered a necropolis older than the walls of Servius Tullius containing more than five thousand archaic specimens in bronze, amber, stone and clay; we have brought to light more than five thousand feet of the great Agger or embankment of Servius, and ascertained the site of fourteen gates; we have unearthed the remains of numberless houses and palaces, temples and shrines, roads and drains, parks and gardens, fora and porticoes, fountains and aqueducts, tombs and mauso-

lea to such an extent that whereas before 1872 science possessed only approximate attempts at an archæological map of Rome, we have put at the disposal of students magnificent ones covering an area of 3,967,200 square metres of the ancient city."

Nero's burning of Rome was constructive not destructive, Professor Lanciani assures us. Though three out of fourteen wards were consumed, not one human life was lost. Imported tents sheltered and grain fed the populace. The public health and convenience as well as external regularity and beauty were consulted in the new city of the architects Severus and Celer. The personal interest of the emperor was maintained by confiscating a square mile of land from the Palatine to the Quirinal on which to build his Golden House.

Curiously, one of the latest discoveries in Greece relates to this Roman emperor. According to Plutarch and others, Nero confirmed on stelæ the grant of independence made to Greece by a herald two centuries before. One of these stelæ has been brought to light, imbedded in a wall near the Copaic Lake, and is now awaiting transportation to Athens.

In such Hellenic exploration even more than heretofore America has borne an honorable part the past year. The American School, in its new quarters and under the indefatigable charge of Professor Merriam of Columbia, has brought to light the site of Dionysus worship in Attica. Mr. Buck of Yale, the discoverer, remains the present season at Athens, while Professor Tarbell of Yale assumes the directorship. Noble woods and tangled ivy mark the site where the god had his home in Icaria. The sculptures of his temple are still in private hands. Some may be seen in a peasant's hut. "Very remarkable is a colossal head of Dionysus worked flat behind and probably intended to be fixed against a wall." The foundations of the shrine of Apollo have been unearthed, permitting the traveler to inspect a most interesting votive tablet to the god who sits on a red omphalos in its centre. Besides this, Dr. Sterrett has edited a collection of Greek inscriptions standing only behind Boeckh and Le Bas Waddington in epigraphical importance. The identification of Lystra by the last scholar, now professor in Miami, is fresh in the memory of our readers.

The Germans, too, may well be elated over their discovery of the Temple of the Kabeiroi near Thebes. It seems to have been a walled enclosure with an altar in the open air: we might have expected the inscriptions to have been dedicated to the Kabeiroi — those eight gods of the Phœnician sailor. They were "to the Kabeiros and his son," pictures of whom appear on a vase.

If the French have been again disappointed at Delphi they have not ceased to rejoice over Susa. Last June saw the opening of the Salle Dieulafoy in the Louvre Museum at Paris. The brilliant colored pictures of the Guard of Darius are incomparable specimens of enamel painting. Even in the copies of Madame Ragozin they are impressive. We do not wonder that the originals created an interest hardly second to the excavations of Cesnola in Cyprus.

To the brilliant discoverer we owe also a lecture on the Book of Esther and the Palace of Ahasuerus, delivered before the Society *des Etudes Juives* last spring. The "S. S. Times" of November 17, 1888, has an able outline of the architectural part of this paper. M. Dieulafoy makes most reasonable the historic truth of this Meghillah, so popular in the Hebrew world, so suspicious in the camp of modern radicalism.

The rationalist denies that *Pur* (whence *Purim*) is a Persian word at all. On the contrary, in itself the word is one of the best known roots of the Aryan tongues. *Par* in Sanscrit, *Por* in Persian, *plere* in Latin, *plein* in French, all contain the same idea. The *Pur* or *Pour* was a Persian die. It may not improbably have been the counterpart of the small quadrangular prism found at Susa, with numbered rectangular faces. To the gaming and superstitious Persian to cast the die was to determine the auspicious day. Persian customs explain the delay, publication, and defeat of the Jewish massacre in the Book of Esther. "Slave of the divine will indicated by the *Pour*, Haman is forced to postpone eleven months the massacre of his hated foes, but hastens notwithstanding to make it irrevocable by sealing and proclaiming the royal decree. Ahasuerus in turn is bound by his previous decision. He can only rescue the Jews by lending them a covert assistance against his Persian subjects." For those who would make Esther a romance with a purpose composed after the Maccabean victory 160 B. C. M. Dienlafoy has a single word. The palace, which is photographed in the Book with a perfect and personal knowledge of the Court of the Great King, must have been standing when the Book was written. The conclusion is irresistible that Esther antedates by far the Parthian Conquest.

France and Germany have been discussing the identification of the names Jacob and Joseph on the tribute lists of Thothmes III. at Karnak by the American Mr. Gross. It is another American, Rev. Lysander Dickerman, who has furnished an excellent epitome of the discussion in the "O. T. Student" of last February. Few will believe the ending EL, affixed to the Patriarchal names, is proof that Jacob and Joseph were worshiped as deities! Many will refuse to infer that the sons of Jacob were never in Egypt, or that the people who in the eleventh century were 40,000 strong, might not have been a feeble folk in the fourteenth. Some will think that, as at the end of Genesis the Hebrews grouped in two tribes, and Scripture is silent about the interim down to the Exodus, the Hieroglyphs may give a lost page of the Bible. Israelites taken in arms against the Pharaoh who knew not Joseph would certainly be treated with the rigor recorded in the second book of the Pentateuch. Mr. Dickerman removes philological barriers to the theory. He does not venture to declare himself among its friends or foes.

From the "O. T. Student" is but a step to Hebraica, which never witnessed more forcibly to the value of Professor Harper's Semitic zeal than now. We would single out for special commendation in 1888 Professor Isaac Hall's Syriac text and translation of the Nestorian Ritual of the Washing of the Dead. The archæology and the theology have an equal charm. Dr. Robert F. Harper, instructor at Yale, published in April the last of several texts, transliterations, and translations of the Esarhaddon Inscriptions. These are of great scholarly value. It is a pleasure to recognize independent and original work in Assyrian of so high an order. His careful and exact collation of the cylinders in the British Museum has well fitted Mr. Harper to make the most of the Babylonian Expedition of which he is now a member.

The recurrence of Forefathers' day has interested one Congregationalist in the genesis of the New England tithing-man from the Saxons. Our grandfathers had sometimes three of these "whippers in," one of whom sat at each door of the meeting-house "to keep out dogs, and one in the gallery to keep in boys." This half laughable, half formidable

personage was wont to carry a tip-staff with a deer's hoof to rap sleeping men, and a squirrel's tail to wake sleeping women. In the mother country the tithing-man was originally the head man of a neighborhood of at least ten families.

There is a black-letter volume in the library of the Massachusetts Historical Society entitled "The Dvties of Constables, Borsholders, Tythingmen and such other lowe and Lay Ministers of the Peace," by William Lambard of Lincolnes Inn^r, Gent, London 1614. In Saxon law are found Tineman, Tynmanna, Teothungman. The Mediæval Latin gives us Decanus, Decimus. Though the institution cannot be traced to Alfred, it can to Canute and Edgar. "It probably rose from the organization of warriors by tens and hundreds." Tithing Township and Parish have the closest connection, as seen in the ending ten and the levy of taxes. The Saxon Tithing-man became the Norman Petty Constable. The main idea of the office was that perpetuated in the original tithing-man of New England, that is, "elective patriarchal headship over at least ten families." He was Town Father, indeed, who might arrest Sabbath-breakers and inspect Licensed Inns in the days of "strong beere, perry, matheglin, and rumme." In the court of the Tithing was the germ of the town meeting. Dr. Adams of Johns Hopkins University has developed the foregoing ideas with great lucidity and learning, and they may be found in No. IV. of the "University Studies."

December 18, 1888, the Metropolitan Museum of New York opened the doors of its new building which was formally presented by the city to the trustees. "In 1870 there was nothing; not even money to begin with, only the will to do." In 1888 the city has invested \$1,100,000 and the members \$2,500,000." Dr. Prime said in his address that the secret of the museum's success lay in its usefulness. Mayor Hewitt, who declared it open, hoped that the time would soon come when it would be open every day in the week, including Sunday. Certainly every American must rejoice at the stately and commodious home at last provided for the accumulated spoils of all races and lands. The archæologist will pass delighted from Assyrian bas-relief to Egyptian sarcophagus, from Babylonian cylinders to the glass of Phœnicia, Greece, and Rome, and from the Pueblo figures and Moundbuilders' relics to the antiquities of Central America, Mexico, and Peru. That we have not only seals and tablets, but a Dr. Hayes Ward to decipher them, and a Dr. I. Hall to interpret our incomparable collection from Cyprus, is matter for no common self-congratulation. The museum will serve the people none the less, if it draws the scholars to its texts and treasures. To-day it is a monument of private liberality conserving the wisdom of an immortal past. To-morrow it will be the Educator of a Continent in the Beautiful, the True, and the Good.

John Phelps Taylor.

SOCIAL ECONOMICS.

I.

THE OUTLINE OF AN ELECTIVE COURSE OF STUDY.

For the full outline, and for general authorities, to be used under Section I, see the January number, pp. 85, 86.

SECTION I. THE SOCIAL EVOLUTION OF LABOR.

Topic 2. *The Workman of the Free Cities.*

REFERENCES.¹ — Italian Republics. Sismondi.

Democracy in Europe. May.

History of Civilization. (Chap. on Free Cities.) Guizot.

Lectures on History of France. (Chap. on Municipalities.) Stephen.

Middle Ages. (Chap. 2, part 2, chap. 4, part 1.) Hallam.

Constitutional History of England. (Chaps. 11, 21.) Stubbs.

History of English People. (Book 3, chap. 1.) Green.

Wealth of Nations. (Book 3, chap. 3.) Adam Smith.

English Gilds. Brentano.

English Economic History. (Chap. on Merchant and Craft Gilds.)

Ashley.

Growth of English Industry and Commerce. (Chap. on the Manor and the Town.) Cunningham.

Conflict of Capital and Labor. (Chap. 1, part 4, Craft Gilds.) Howells.

Work and Wages. (Chap. 6.) Rogers.

Economic Interpretation of History. (Chap. 4, The Gild and Apprenticeship System.) Rogers.

NOTES. — The Free Cities of Europe played an important part in the advancement of labor and the laboring classes in these three particulars: —

1. In the extension of popular freedom through the gaining of municipal rights.

2. In the protection which they afforded to serfs from the country, not infrequently ending in their emancipation.

3. In the opportunities which they offered for the organization of labor. The craft gild of the free cities represents both the development of labor and its defense. It secured to a considerable degree the rights of the workman and it increased the value of his work. Like its successor the Trade-Union, it had its restrictions and its petty tyrannies, but it marks the first step in the general and orderly progress of labor, and in this view is worthy of careful study.

The inhabitants of the early towns compared with the proprietors of land.

"The inhabitants of cities and towns were, after the fall of the Roman empire, not more favored than those of the country. They consisted, indeed, of a very different order of people from the first inhabitants of the ancient republics."

¹ The references which are here given are chiefly to books which are accessible in the ordinary public libraries or which may be easily obtained, and the extracts which follow are quoted to suggest the direction and scope of thought under the topic.

lies of Greece and Italy. These last were composed chiefly of the proprietors of lands, among whom the public territory was originally divided, and who found it convenient to build their houses in the neighborhood of one another, and to surround them with a wall, for the sake of common defense. After the fall of the Roman empire, on the contrary, the proprietors of land seem generally to have lived in fortified castles on their own estates, and in the midst of their own tenants and dependants. The towns were chiefly inhabited by tradesmen and mechanics, who seem in those days to have been of servile or very nearly of servile condition. The privileges which we find granted by ancient charters to the inhabitants of some of the principal towns in Europe sufficiently show what they were before those grants. The people to whom it is granted as a privilege that they might give away their own daughters in marriage without the consent of their lord, that upon their death their own children, and not their lord, should succeed to their goods, and that they might dispose of their own effects by will, must, before these grants, have been either altogether, or very nearly in the same state of villanage with the occupiers of land in the country. . . . But how servile soever may have been originally the condition of the inhabitants of the towns, it appears evidently that they arrived at liberty and independency much earlier than the occupiers of the land in the country. That part of the king's revenue which arose from such poll-taxes in any particular town, used commonly to be let in farm, during a term of years for a certain rent, sometimes to the sheriff of the county, and sometimes to other persons. The burghers themselves frequently got credit enough to be admitted to farm the revenues of this sort which arose out of their own town, they becoming jointly and severally answerable for the whole rent. To let a farm in this manner was quite agreeable to the usual economy of, I believe, the sovereigns of all the different countries of Europe, who used frequently to let whole manors to all the tenants of those manors, they becoming jointly and severally answerable for the whole rent, but in return being allowed to collect it in their own way, and to pay it into the king's exchequer by the hands of their own bailiff, and being thus altogether freed from the insolence of the king's officers; a circumstance in those days regarded as of the greatest importance. . . . Along with the grant, the important privileges above mentioned, that they might give away their own daughters in marriage, that their children should succeed to them, and that they might dispose of their own effects by will, were generally bestowed upon the burghers of the town to whom it was given. Whether such privileges had before been usually granted along with the freedom of trade to particular burghers, as individuals, I know not. I reckon it not improbable that they were, though I cannot produce any direct evidence of it. But, however this may have been, the principal attributes of villanage and slavery being thus taken away from them, they now, at least, became really free in our present sense of the word Freedom." — *Adam Smith*. "Wealth of Nations." Book iii., chap. 3.

For contrast between different types of town life, Italian, German, French, and English, see Stubbs's Constitutional History of England. vol. i. pp. 420-424 (chap. 11).

The Charter granted the City of London by William the Conqueror is as follows:—

"William the King greets William the Bishop and Gosfrith the portreeve, and all the burghers within London, French and English, friendly; and I do you to wit that I will that ye twain be worthy of all the law that ye were worthy of in King Edward's day. And I will that every child be his father's heir after his father's day; and I will not endure that any man offer any wrong to you. God keep you."

The study of the growth of London as a city, under successive charters, will show the rate and method of the enlargement of municipal rights.

Municipal rights in France were chiefly gained by concessions granted by the King for aid rendered against the barons.

The Struggle for Municipal freedom was followed by the Struggle of classes within the cities.

"At the time we have reached (1216) this struggle for emancipation was nearly over. The larger towns had secured the privilege of self-government, the administration of justice, and the control of their own trade. The reigns of Richard and John mark the date in one municipal history at which towns began to acquire the right of electing their own chief magistrate, the Portreeve or Mayor, who had till then been a nominee of the crown. But with the close of this outer struggle opened an inner struggle between the various classes of the townsmen themselves. The growth of wealth and industry was bringing with it a vast increase of population. The mass of the new settlers, composed as they were of escaped serfs, of traders without landed holdings, of families who had lost their original lot in the borough, and generally of the artisans and the poor, had no part in the actual life of the town. The right of trade, and of the regulation of trade, in common with all other forms of jurisdiction, lay wholly in the hands of the landed burghers whom we have described. By a natural process, too, their superiority in wealth produced a fresh division between the 'burghers' of the merchant-gild and the unfranchised mass around them. The same change which severed at Florence the seven Greater Arts or trades from the fourteen Lesser Arts, and which raised the three occupations of banking, the manufacture and the dyeing of cloth, to a position of superiority even within the privileged circle of the seven, told, though with less force, on the English boroughs. The burghers of the merchant-gild gradually concentrated themselves on the greater operations of commerce, on trades which required a larger capital, while the meaner employments of general traffic were abandoned to their poorer neighbors. This advance in the division of labor is marked by such severances as we note in the thirteenth century of the cloth merchant from the tailor, or the leather merchant from the butcher.

"But the result of this severance was all-important in its influence on the constitution of our towns. The members of the trades thus abandoned by the wealthier burghers formed themselves into craft-gilds, which soon rose into dangerous rivalry with the original merchant-gild of the town."

"From the eleventh century the spread of these societies went steadily on, and the control of trade passed more and more from the merchant-gilds to the craft-gilds.

"It is this struggle, to use the technical terms of the time, of the 'greater folk' against the 'lesser folk,' or of the 'commune,' the general mass of the inhabitants, against the 'prudhommes,' or 'wiser' few, which brought about, as it passed from the regulation of trade to the general government of the town, the great civic revolution of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. On the continent, and especially along the Rhine, the struggle was as fierce as the supremacy of the older burghers had been complete. In Köln the craftsmen had been reduced to all but serfage, and the merchant of Brussels might box at his will the ears of 'the man without heart or honour who lives by his toil.' Such social tyranny of class over class brought a century of bloodshed to the cities of Germany; but in England the tyranny of class over class was restrained by the general tenor of the law, and the revolution took for the most part a milder form." — Green, "History of the English People." Book iii., chap. 1.

The relation of Merchant Gilds to the growth of Municipalities.

"The history of the merchant guild, in its relation to the craft guild, on the one hand, and to the municipal government on the other, is very complex. In its main features it is a most important illustration of the principle which constantly

lies of Greece and Italy. These last were composed chiefly of the proprietors of lands, among whom the public territory was originally divided, and who found it convenient to build their houses in the neighborhood of one another, and to surround them with a wall, for the sake of common defense. After the fall of the Roman empire, on the contrary, the proprietors of land seem generally to have lived in fortified castles on their own estates, and in the midst of their own tenants and dependants. The towns were chiefly inhabited by tradesmen and mechanics, who seem in those days to have been of servile or very nearly of servile condition. The privileges which we find granted by ancient charters to the inhabitants of some of the principal towns in Europe sufficiently show what they were before those grants. The people to whom it is granted as a privilege that they might give away their own daughters in marriage without the consent of their lord, that upon their death their own children, and not their lord, should succeed to their goods, and that they might dispose of their own effects by will, must, before these grants, have been either altogether, or very nearly in the same state of villanage with the occupiers of land in the country. . . . But how servile soever may have been originally the condition of the inhabitants of the towns, it appears evidently that they arrived at liberty and independency much earlier than the occupiers of the land in the country. That part of the king's revenue which arose from such poll-taxes in any particular town, used commonly to be let in farm, during a term of years for a certain rent, sometimes to the sheriff of the county, and sometimes to other persons. The burghers themselves frequently got credit enough to be admitted to farm the revenues of this sort which arose out of their own town, they becoming jointly and severally answerable for the whole rent. To let a farm in this manner was quite agreeable to the usual economy of, I believe, the sovereigns of all the different countries of Europe, who used frequently to let whole manors to all the tenants of those manors, they becoming jointly and severally answerable for the whole rent, but in return being allowed to collect it in their own way, and to pay it into the king's exchequer by the hands of their own bailiff, and being thus altogether freed from the insolence of the king's officers; a circumstance in those days regarded as of the greatest importance. . . . Along with the grant, the important privileges above mentioned, that they might give away their own daughters in marriage, that their children should succeed to them, and that they might dispose of their own effects by will, were generally bestowed upon the burghers of the town to whom it was given. Whether such privileges had before been usually granted along with the freedom of trade to particular burghers, as individuals, I know not. I reckon it not improbable that they were, though I cannot produce any direct evidence of it. But, however this may have been, the principal attributes of villanage and slavery being thus taken away from them, they now, at least, became really free in our present sense of the word Freedom." — *Adam Smith. "Wealth of Nations." Book iii, chap. 3.*

For contrast between different types of town life, Italian, German, French, and English, see Stubbs's Constitutional History of England, vol. i. pp. 420-424 (chap. 11).

The Charter granted the City of London by William the Conqueror is as follows:—

"William the King greets William the Bishop and Gosfrith the portreeve, and all the burghers within London, French and English, friendly; and I do you to wit that I will that ye twain be worthy of all the law that ye were worthy of in King Edward's day. And I will that every child be his father's heir after his father's day; and I will not endure that any man offer any wrong to you. God keep you."

The study of the growth of London as a city, under successive charters, will show the rate and method of the enlargement of municipal rights.

Municipal rights in France were chiefly gained by concessions granted by the King for aid rendered against the barons.

The Struggle for Municipal freedom was followed by the Struggle of classes within the cities.

"At the time we have reached (1216) this struggle for emancipation was nearly over. The larger towns had secured the privilege of self-government, the administration of justice, and the control of their own trade. The reigns of Richard and John mark the date in one municipal history at which towns began to acquire the right of electing their own chief magistrate, the Portreeve or Mayor, who had till then been a nominee of the crown. But with the close of this outer struggle opened an inner struggle between the various classes of the townsmen themselves. The growth of wealth and industry was bringing with it a vast increase of population. The mass of the new settlers, composed as they were of escaped serfs, of traders without landed holdings, of families who had lost their original lot in the borough, and generally of the artisans and the poor, had no part in the actual life of the town. The right of trade, and of the regulation of trade, in common with all other forms of jurisdiction, lay wholly in the hands of the landed burghers whom we have described. By a natural process, too, their superiority in wealth produced a fresh division between the 'burghers' of the merchant-gild and the unfranchised mass around them. The same change which severed at Florence the seven Greater Arts or trades from the fourteen Lesser Arts, and which raised the three occupations of banking, the manufacture and the dyeing of cloth, to a position of superiority even within the privileged circle of the seven, told, though with less force, on the English boroughs. The burghers of the merchant-gild gradually concentrated themselves on the greater operations of commerce, on trades which required a larger capital, while the meaner employments of general traffic were abandoned to their poorer neighbors. This advance in the division of labor is marked by such severances as we note in the thirteenth century of the cloth merchant from the tailor, or the leather merchant from the butcher.

"But the result of this severance was all-important in its influence on the constitution of our towns. The members of the trades thus abandoned by the wealthier burghers formed themselves into craft-gilds, which soon rose into dangerous rivalry with the original merchant-gild of the town."

"From the eleventh century the spread of these societies went steadily on, and the control of trade passed more and more from the merchant-gilds to the craft-gilds.

"It is this struggle, to use the technical terms of the time, of the 'greater folk' against the 'lesser folk,' or of the 'commune,' the general mass of the inhabitants, against the 'prudhommes,' or 'wiser' few, which brought about, as it passed from the regulation of trade to the general government of the town, the great civic revolution of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. On the continent, and especially along the Rhine, the struggle was as fierce as the supremacy of the older burghers had been complete. In Köln the craftsmen had been reduced to all but serfage, and the merchant of Brussels might box at his will the ears of 'the man without heart or honour who lives by his toil.' Such social tyranny of class over class brought a century of bloodshed to the cities of Germany; but in England the tyranny of class over class was restrained by the general tenor of the law, and the revolution took for the most part a milder form." — Green, "History of the English People." Book iii., chap. 1.

The relation of Merchant Gilds to the growth of Municipalities.

"The history of the merchant guild, in its relation to the craft guild, on the one hand, and to the municipal government on the other, is very complex. In its main features it is a most important illustration of the principle which constantly

forces itself forward in mediæval history, that the vindication of class privileges is one of the most effective ways of securing public liberty, so long as public liberty is endangered by the general pressure of tyranny. At one time the church stands alone in her opposition to despotism, with her free instincts roused by the determination to secure the privilege of her ministers; at another the mercantile class purchase for themselves rights and immunities which keep before the eyes of the less highly favored the possibility of gaining similar privileges. In both cases it is to some extent an acquisition of exclusive privilege, an assertion of a right which, if the surrounding classes were already free, would look like usurpation, but which, when they are down-trodden, gives a glimpse and is itself an instalment of liberty. But when the general liberty, towards which the class privilege was an important step, has been fully obtained, it is not unnatural that the classes which led the way to that liberty should endeavor to retain all honors and privileges which they can retain without harm to the public welfare. But the original quality of exclusiveness which defined the circle for which privilege was claimed still exists; still it is an immunity, a privilege in its strict meaning, and as such it involves an exception in its own favor to the general rules of the liberty now acquired by the community around it; and if this is so, it may exercise a power as great for harm as it was at first for good. Such is one of the laws of the history of all privileged corporations; fortunately it is not the only law, and its working is not the whole of their history. It applies, however, directly to the guild system." — *Stubbs*, "Constitutional History," chap. 21.

The origin and object of Craft-Gilds.

"Although the Craft-Gilds arose first among the most eminent of the handicraft class, among those who were free, — just as in earlier times the most ancient gilds originated among the old freemen, and later on the Trade-Unions among the best situated workingmen and *ci-devant* small masters, — to stop the deterioration of their condition and encroachments on their rights and interests, yet this new organization was also soon made use of by the lower members of their class as a means of elevation. With the liberation of the bond handicraftsmen from bondage proper, many of the companies into which they had been ranged passed gradually over into the number of free Craft Gilds. The latter appear, therefore, everywhere in greater number about the time when the last traces of bondage disappear. Craft-Gilds of this kind, when obtaining their privileges, were frequently put under obligation to pay certain fixed imposts in return for their greater independence in labor and trade, and for the remission of the fines on inheriting property, to which their episcopal or lay lords were entitled, as well as for other masters. And in proportion to the degree of independence which they obtained according to circumstances, these imposts were greater or smaller. Everywhere, however, these societies were changed after the manner of the Gilds of those farther advanced craftsmen which have been spoken of. The latter impregnated them with an altogether different spirit and a new life. A similar process may have taken place, in certain cases, in fraternities originally religious, which, after the origin of Craft-Gilds, framed trade regulations after the latter's example, and — as in later times certain friendly societies changed into Trade-Unions — so gradually transformed themselves into Craft-Gilds. The time of the origin of Craft-Gilds in general may be said to extend from the beginning of the eleventh to the middle of the thirteenth century. The origin of certain Craft-Gilds depended, of course, on the gradual rise of the various trades in a town." — *Brentano*, "English Gilds," 94, p. cxvii.

"It was, as we have seen, in the second half of the eleventh century that merchant gilds began to come into existence; during the twelfth century they arose in all considerable English towns. The rise of *craft gilds* is, roughly speaking, a century later. Isolated examples occur early in the twelfth century; they become more numerous as the century advances, and in the thirteenth century they appear in all branches of manufacture and in every industrial centre.

"Craft guilds were associations of all the artisans engaged in a particular industry in a particular town, for certain common purposes: what those purposes were will be seen later. Their appearance marks the second stage in the history of industry, the transition from the *family system* to the *artisan (or gild) system*. In the former there was no class of artisans properly so called; no class, that is to say, of men whose time was entirely or chiefly devoted to a particular manufacture, and this because all the needs of a family or domestic group, whether of monastery or manor-house, were satisfied by the labor of the members of the group itself. The latter, on the contrary, is marked by the presence of a body of men each of whom was occupied more or less completely in one particular manufacture. The very growth from the one to the other system, therefore, is an example of 'division of labor,' or, to use a better phrase, of 'division of employments.'" — Ashley, "English Economic History." Book i., chap. 2.

The place of the Apprenticeship System in the Development of Labor.

"I am speaking, you will observe, of the work of artisans, five centuries ago. A study of the conditions under which they lived and worked, many of their works being still before us, convinces me that, whatever may be said against apprenticeship in time present, it was a necessary condition for the art and labour of the past. It is quite possible that an art may have outlived its usefulness, and though there was a time when it was requisite, that time has been followed by another, when it has become superfluous or even mischievous. What I wish you to notice is, that when we project ourselves into a bygone age, we cannot conclude invariably with those who, however far-sighted and shrewd they are, are unable to realize, from lack of facts, these remote conditions. It is a common and dangerous error to interpret the past by the present. It is a true and necessary philosophy to interpret the present by the past, and I have some satisfaction in knowing that whatever be the worth of my own comment — judge it as you will — I have provided means by which others after me will be able to realize for themselves the bygone, but by no means exhausted conditions of past industrial life. And I may mention as part of these facts, that Acts of Parliament not infrequently provide for the apprenticeship of laborers in husbandry, meaning by this, I am sure, those higher agricultural operations which require special knack and acuteness, and formed the qualifications of the first-class farm-hand, whom our ancestors were wont to describe as a bailiff in husbandry, who directed all operations, and could do everything which he directed. These apprenticeships, Sir John Sinclair informs us, survived in the West to the present century." — Thorold Rogers, "Economic Interpretation of History," chap. 14.

For wages, hours of work, and methods of living of the artisan class of Mediæval England, see Rogers's "Work and Wages," chap. 6, pp. 178-187.

For the same, three centuries later, see Arnold Toynbee's "Industrial Revolution," chap. 6.

William Jewett Tucker.

ANDOVER.

II.

SOCIOLOGICAL NOTES.

THERE are many indications that the question of *Sabbath Observance* has ceased to be exclusively the concern of religion. Hitherto Sunday labor has been almost entirely personal service — necessary care for man and beast. Accordingly Sunday has been disregarded only by the careless and irreverent, a class comparatively easy to deal with, at least among English-speaking people, where such have been hitherto in a decided minority. Our multitudinous State Sunday laws have really been

directed against a shadowy and somewhat imaginary enemy. But since the invention of machinery, and the rise of the modern industrial system, the pressure of competition on the part of Capital and Labor has led to the use of Sunday for *productive* industry. Accordingly, from now on, the friends of the Sunday rest have to contend with the money power, the extra dollar for the laborer, extra thousands for the employer. Avarice is a worse enemy to the Sabbath than irreverence or mere pleasure seeking. It has now become necessary for economists to decide whether it is true that an industry running seven days in a week can undersell one running six, that is, whether unrestricted competition of trade will inevitably compel Sunday labor. Again, if this is so, whether the extra dollar a week given to those laborers who work on Sunday will enable them to drive to the wall in the struggle for existence those who will not work upon Sundays; that is, is the "fittest" in this iron mill of competition, one who denies himself all time for culture and thought by working 365 days in the year? Then Sociology must measure the effect of such competition of Capital against Capital, and Labor against Labor, upon the human race. Are religion and hygiene right in saying that it is good for mind and body to rest one day in seven? Are these higher interests to be sacrificed to the demands of materialized employers and brutalized laborers? That the question is by no means a theoretical one was amply proved by the report of the investigation into Sunday labor made to the German Reichstag in November, 1887, a voluminous work, admirably summarized by H. Soetbeer in Conrad's "Jahrbücher," September, 1888, which we follow.

Persistent agitation of this subject in the German Reichstag began in 1872. Finally, in 1885, Bismarck authorized the investigation. His own opinion he expressed in the Reichstag on January 9, 1882, saying that Sunday labor brought both to the employer and laborer one seventh of their income, and he did not know how such a diminution of income could be made good or borne; and again, upon May 9, 1885: "Of what use to the people are higher things if they are hungry?" Certainly as candid a confession of the break-down of industrial competition as even Prince Krapotkin could desire. This investigation called out responses from about 40,000 employers and 30,000 workmen, besides numberless societies and officers. As far as Prussia was concerned, it proved that in thirty government districts fifty-seven per cent. of the industries employed upon Sunday forty-two per cent. of their workmen! These figures are only approximate, and yet more definite than it is possible to give for the whole empire, for the questions asked did not call for mathematical answers. In these answers very many grounds were assigned for Sunday labor, most commonly the conditions of production, need of protecting from the weather in out-door industries, of using water and wind power, which is fluctuating, of saving perishable stuffs in creameries, packing establishments, refineries, etc. Moreover, Sunday work is reported unavoidable in the manufacture of certain chemicals, beer, and malt where the process extends beyond seven days. When the process requires only four or five days, Sundays must be used unless several days each week are thrown away. In other industries, for example, tanning and brickmaking, the materials cannot be left to themselves twenty-four hours. In metal work of all kinds, ovens cannot be cooled without danger from cracking or from poisonous gases. Industries like the manufacturing of sugar from beets are confined to a certain period of the

year, and utilize Sunday, or their output is diminished by a large per cent. Again, Sunday is taken to do work that cannot be done while all the machinery is running, in clearing, repairing, etc., or making castings which are dangerous or delicate. Or, again, parts of the work that are behind are run on Sundays to catch up with the rest, often the continuance of the whole process depending upon it. So workmen make up for absences during the week. Certain work requires the daylight, or the danger of fire and explosion is great, and so in winter Sunday is used. Much stuff is moved and carried by land and water on Sunday to save storage and the loss of costly time. In other industries Sunday work is founded upon the fact that their activity is limited to certain seasons, or days, like various kinds of summer work in the field, provision for travelers, or heating and lighting in winter, getting ready for the Monday market day, so usual in Germany, or providing the refreshments for the Sunday holiday. With small trades Sunday is the best day because more workmen are then at leisure with money in their pockets. In shoe shops and photograph galleries the Sunday trade is often three or four times that of any other day, shoemakers cobbling on Sunday the one pair of shoes possessed by workmen or school-children. Further, some work must be done on Sunday owing to accidents of all kinds. Business competition is the direct cause of much Sunday labor, — especially among small shopkeepers, — for if one keeps open Sundays, all must or lose their business; a clear case of the survival of the "unfittest," morally. Further, struggling manufactures avail themselves of Sunday labor to meet the competition of larger factories which do not run on Sunday. Finally, competition in the marts of the world compels German manufactures to favor all devices that cheapen the product — long hours, uninterrupted use of capital in all its appliances. The answer to the question as to the frequency of Sunday labor is implied in what has preceded. Sunday labor will evidently obtain where there is occasion for it. In the words of the report: "In general, regular and continued Sunday work obtains in large factories, mostly in continuous processes and repairs, in handicraft, if not universally, yet very frequently in the smaller ones, especially those connected with a shop and supplying the daily needs of the public; while it has its greatest expansion in retail trade." Even in these cases all the employees are not always called out upon Sunday, sometimes working in relays, sometimes on alternate Sundays, yet many employees report that they have not had a free day for months. In many cases the character of the employer is said to determine the question of Sunday labor. Catholic employers are reported to keep the Sunday better than Protestants, and the priests are reported as frustrating energetic attempts of employers to compel Sunday work. A witty shoemaker reports from Baden that he allows no work on Sunday because his customers belong to the rich class who do not trade on Sunday, because he is himself rich, and because he has been a Pietist for a year back!

Answers to the question as to the probable results of forbidding Sunday labor are interesting. Bakers, barbers, photographers, saloon and hotel keepers anticipate destruction of business. Manufacturers say they will be able to work to full capacity only two or three days in the middle of the week, with great loss of power on the part of men and machinery. Others think the police enforcement of such a law would be burdensome, and the conscientious man would be undersold by him who evaded and

defied the law. Many expect a shifting of industries, in some cases a transfer to private houses where Sunday labor could be concealed; in others a concentration in great establishments. A minority think industry could adapt itself to such an order without serious loss. Some point out that the manufacturers would be indemnified by the increased price incident to decreased production. As regards the workmen themselves it is noteworthy that great numbers report that they are eager for the opportunity to work on Sunday. "Sunday work is better than night work." In many cases the opportunity is given as a special favor to older persons, married men, the especially deserving, etc. Cases are reported of men who were employed six days by a man with conscientious scruples, and regularly upon Sundays by a man with none. Indeed, it is becoming increasingly difficult for an establishment working only six days to get laborers, the Sunday pay being in many cases one and one fourth to twice that of week-days. According to the Report, forbidding Sunday labor will have the same effect upon workingmen as upon employers. If they do less work they expect less pay, except, perhaps, in the case of men paid by the year or month. The class just upon the edge of subsistence have most to fear. Some look for an increase of the Socialists and Anarchists from the discharge of many laborers following upon a readjustment of industries. The brighter workmen see that ultimately as many will be employed as now, and await eagerly an enlarged opportunity for religious and social culture. "One scarcely sees his children now," one complains. Another says, "If Sunday labor is forbidden, one will belong to his family one whole day; can again learn to love, and visit with his children the house of God; go walking; in short, again feel himself a man and not a labor slave. Sunday labor robs man of his worth and self-respect and lowers him in every way." It is frequently said in the Report that a properly spent Sunday gives the laborer a greater freshness of mind and body, and results in better, more economical work, — twenty per cent. better, one employer says. Some employers report that they have given up Sunday labor after experimenting with it. Others on the contrary, even workingmen, reply that men if not employed on Sunday would spend the day in dissipation and drink, — a fear only too well grounded in the facts of German life. Indeed, some employers make their men work Sundays in order to keep up their *morale*; otherwise "they spend their week's wages, and the church is the last place they go to." Evidently the moral and physical effect of a free Sunday depends entirely upon the use made of it.

Many workingmen report that they prefer to work on Sundays because they have nothing to do at home, and suffer from *ennui* — a sentiment to which the idle convicts in our State prisons would probably subscribe. The deep hold that Sunday labor has in Germany is indicated by the answer to the question as to the possibility of enforcing a law forbidding Sunday work. Of 22,617 employers, thirty-six per cent. think it impossible to enforce such a law, and thirty-nine per cent. think it can be enforced with exceptions. Of 15,284 workingmen, the proportion for non-enforcement is twenty-seven per cent; for enforcement with exceptions, forty-one per cent. In a word, only twenty-three per cent. of the employers and thirty-two per cent. of the laborers think Sunday labor can be totally stopped. It should be said that these are the answers of persons engaged in such labor. Stress is everywhere laid upon the impossibility of enforcing a Sunday law in small shops and

houses, and the difficulty of making exceptions. The impression left by the Report of a bad state of things was so strong that in the Reichstag in March, 1888, Sunday labor was partly forbidden in an amendment to the laws governing industries. In general, this forbids Sunday labor in certain industries, in mines, foundries, factories, building, etc.; allows it in shops for five hours, longer at the discretion of the local police authorities; also in repairing and works of necessity, in public-houses, and in transportation. Allows it, further, at the discretion of the Imperial Council, where the processes and times of manufacturing demand. The workmen are to have at least every second Sunday free. This bill had October 1st yet to receive the sanction of the Imperial Council.

In America this problem is already confronting us. Since 1828 there have been almost *Annual Sabbath Conventions*. The last — which is also the *First National Sabbath Convention* — was held in Washington in December last. At the meeting was introduced a petition for the "Sunday Rest" bill which contained 6,000,000 names, supported by the appeal of Cardinal Gibbons and the Labor Organization. We lack information as to the extent of Sunday labor in the United States. The sixteenth annual report of the Massachusetts Bureau of Statistics of Labor, August, 1885, is very meagre. According to this, eighty-one per cent. of the employees of horse railroads work on Sunday. If one fourth of the railroad men in the United States work on Sunday, the total number would not be far from 250,000. To these must be added great numbers employed in breweries, refineries, hotels, etc.

It would be wiser if reformers acknowledged at the start the necessity of a large amount of Sunday labor, mostly in personal service, and devoted themselves to preventing unnecessary productive industry upon the Sabbath. They may well resist any tendency to Germanize the American Sunday, industrially as well as socially. They must consider how to make Sunday more useful in the culture of those who do not work, and by what social and religious influences they can reach those who do. If Sunday is necessarily lost to so large a body of our citizens, what is to take its place? How will religion and culture through organized institutions reach those who have varying days of rest, much more those who have none at all?

D. Collin Wells.

ANDOVER.

BOOK REVIEWS AND NOTICES.

HOW THEY LIVED IN HAMPTON. A Study of Practical Christianity applied in the Manufacture of Woolens. By EDWARD EVERETT HALE, D. D. Pp. 281. Boston: J. Stilman Smith & Co.

In this book Dr. Hale has made, what will seem to many, a very honest effort to bring the principles of the Sermon on the Mount into practical operation "in the manufacture of woolens." It goes without saying that what is feasible in the manufacture of woolens is practicable in all branches of legitimate business. The story seems so entirely matter-of-fact, and everything adopted at Hampton seems so exactly what ought to be everywhere, that one rises from the perusal of the book with a feeling of surprise that business of this kind should ever be conducted

on any lower plane or in any other way. Capital, talent, and work-power seem, in this book, to have found their right relations. The experiment begins with confidence, because honesty, fairness, and thoroughness are to be constant elements in the enterprise. To get good workmen, to do good work, to take no unfair advantage of ignorance, to conduct everything without suspicious reserve, openly, and with confidence in the reasonableness of the men employed to do the manual part of the business, this was the determination from the beginning. The concern has its trying times, and its dark days which test the quality of the workmen as well as the fortitude of the management. The unreasonable and dissatisfied fall away, much to the advantage of those who remain. The influence on the character of the employees (if that be the proper word in this case) is very marked. The system tends to a constant enlargement of life. Common interests produce a community spirit. The clear and undoubted superiority of the work-people is soon manifest. Profits are so adjusted that every one has a personal interest in the promotion of the success of the firm. The original element in the book is that which concerns itself with the value of management. The argument is directed to show that between Capital and Labor there is a middle term on which the safety of Capital and the profit of Labor depend. Skilled management is worth as much pecuniarily as Capital is worth,—yes, and this will be the most difficult of all ideas to get into anything like adequate appreciation,—it is of equal pecuniary value with the sum of the manual labor. Money power, brain power, and work power are brought into harmonious and profitable coöperation. The value of the book consists largely in the fact that it suggests nothing which does not seem easily possible. It may be that this will make it, of all recent books on social economics, both the most useful and the least acceptable. "Such plans for the good of all," writes the author, "as those attempted at Hampton, could not have been carried out in any heathen civilization. They would have failed in ancient Rome; they would have failed in Athens; they would have failed in ancient Jerusalem. They belong only in the social system founded by the Saviour of mankind, among men and women who hope to live in His Spirit and by His Law."

Reuben Thomas.

BROOKLINE, MASS.

THE CRITICAL PERIOD OF AMERICAN HISTORY, 1783-1789. By JOHN FISKE. "I am uneasy and apprehensive, more so than during the war." Jay to Washington, June 27, 1786. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Company. Pp. xviii, 368. 1888. \$2.00.

Of course there is no need to commend an historical work of Mr. Fiske. The treatment in this moves on the even height of unfailing ability. We may rest in the consciousness that its judgments are as near objective infallibility as we have any practical occasion for.

The English instincts of self-government had secured our independence of England. And Mr. Fiske's calm narrative makes us shiver as we see how these same instincts went relentlessly on for six years to carry out their work, until at one time it seemed as if the only check to a thirteenfold anarchy lay in the hope that, instead of one miserable confederacy, there might be two miserable confederacies, a Northern and a

Southern, and not absolute commination. Patrick Henry, the very man who had thrilled the continent by declaring that he knew neither Virginians nor New Englanders, only Americans, was foremost in desiring a separate Southern league. He cannot be charged with treacherousness to American nationality, for it remained yet to be proved whether this was to be anything more than the old Greek nationality, a community of origin, language, and habits, with constant collisions of interests.

Here again it is delightful to see how the most searching truth of history thoroughly justifies the popular instinct which calls Washington the Father of his Country. And yet even popular instinct has failed to grasp the fact that the passionate energy of his efforts towards a real union, and his large forecast of the means to it, made him just as really the central column of hope during these six ignominious years as during the eight preceding. It is wonderful to see how he waited on opportunity, how, when eminent men were half contemptuous, half jealous of the West, he foresaw all the vastness of destiny there waiting to be disclosed, and was the first to lay out those great lines of communication which have made the Union a permanent possibility. Very few have known what Mr. Fiske relates, how it was his quiet suggestions which enlarged the terms of negotiation between Maryland and Virginia concerning the connection of the Potomac with the Ohio, and gave the effective impulse to the calling of the Convention of 1787. "Washington took the occasion to suggest that Maryland and Virginia, while they were about it, should agree upon a uniform system of duties and other commercial regulations, and upon a uniform currency; and these suggestions were sent, together with the compact, to the legislatures of the two States. Great things were destined to come from these modest beginnings. Just as in the Yorktown campaign, there had come into existence a multifarious assemblage of events, apparently unconnected with one another, and all that was needed was the impulse given by Washington's far-sighted genius to set them all at work, surging, swelling, and hurrying straightforward to a decisive result."

Mr. Fiske, with his usual delight in going back to the *primordia rerum*, points out how, as it was the glorious English inheritance of local self-government, derived, in its turn, from far Holstein, that gave us an independent America, so it was another instinct, likewise transmitted from the banks of the Schley, — the habit of providing for a common domain of the whole people, — that broke the disposition of the individual States to insist upon their claims beyond the Alleghanies, and converted the Northwest Territory into a mighty folkland. Here the first preparatory essays of national sovereignty were made, and that on so ample a scale, that when largely retrenched within the Constitution, the central government had still all the powers that it needed. And Mr. Fiske, now that the pendulum has swung to the opposite extreme, does essential service in lending the weight of his high authority to the assurance that, if we would not wreck ourselves on the other side, we must maintain inviolable the harmonious autonomy of the State within the Union. The "Christian Union" does well — and doubtless other strongly nationalizing journals — to warn us of the latent danger in schemes of some new way of choosing our presidents that shall endanger the federal principle on which the uniqueness of our national life rests. It was a journal which we had little cause to love during the Rebellion that after it coined the phrase "an indissoluble union of indestructible states"; but the phrase

is none the less pregnantly and profoundly true. It is to be hoped that we shall never, as Mr. Freeman warningly expresses it, depress the great names of Massachusetts and Virginia till they mean no more relatively than Bedfordshire or Devon.

As Massachusetts gave the first impulse to an independent America, it was Maryland, as Mr. Fiske points out, that gave the first impulse to a united America. It was her wise importunity, urged at a critical time, that determined the various States which had claims in the great valley to their disinterested surrender of these to the federal authority. And as it was the success of the Connecticut plan in the Convention, of conciliating the large with the small States, by conceding inequality in one house and equality in the other, that finally assured the achievement of the Union, the small States have no need to veil their crests. As to New York, she was the same tormenting uncertainty then that she has been ever since.

Mr. Fiske develops most luminously the preceding negotiations for peace, and the consummate ability with which the American commissioners, violating no promise given, yet allowed the mutual jealousies of France and England to redound to the securing of all those advantages without which our independence would have been merely a veiled dependence on two suzerains instead of one. Indeed, as it was, we had to fight the war of 1812 before we could beat out of the head of our revered parent the notion that these were the terms finally agreed upon. Mr. Fiske's facts, although still showing Jay to have been essentially the one that saved us from the misery of sinking into a mere incoherent seaboard belt, vindicate Franklin from the charge of having been rather an incubrance than a help to the negotiations. His influence over the French was indispensable. The truth is, Mr. Fiske's large presentation of simple fact is the very best vindication of the essential excellence of each one of the chief fathers of our Republic. It throws Washington out into even more pronounced supremacy, but it gives us good occasion to thank God for Madison, and Hamilton, and Jefferson, and for many others. There is a touch of pathos in his description of Samuel Adams, the Father of the Revolution, mighty because of his thorough training in the traditions of the Town-meeting, but failing of the final honors which he really deserved only because he was a little slow in appreciating the other side of the question. The constellation of men, and conjunction of events, each having doubtless some due antecedent, nevertheless gives us the profound impression that we are following the coördinations of a Divine Wisdom.

Mr. Fiske's book, for the very reason that it is instinct with a deeply calm enthusiasm of American nationality, is loyal to the truth that this is a differentiation of English nationality. The Dean of Gloucester had a sense, though a confused one, that the centre of gravity would shift hitherward, as Berkeley had had before him. But to degrade our national consciousness by making ourselves out to be a mere *Mischwolk*, a mere hotch-potch that has somehow or other tumbled together on this side the sea, and come out a huge golden calf, with no deep unity of history and of memories with the glorious island, is a baseness that we may leave to the fawning flatterers of those inferior nationalities, alien to the traditions of our race, that are striving to make us another Issachar, a patient ass bowing the tributary shoulder to their divisive plottings. No strain among us, whatever its origin, can be effectively American, until

it has ungrudgingly joined the main current of our development. As Niebuhr and Arnold have pointed out, it is the neglect to cherish such a consciousness which has so commonly made the history of colonies, however sensuously brilliant, morally a sterile one.

Charles C. Starbuck.

CHRISTIAN ARCHÆOLOGY. By CHARLES W. BENNETT, D. D., Professor of Historical Theology in Garrett Biblical Institute, Evanston, Illinois. With an Introductory Notice by DR. FERDINAND PIPER, Professor of Church History and Christian Archæology in the University of Berlin. [Vol. iv. of Library of Biblical and Theological Literature edited by George R. Crooks, D. D., and John F. Hurst, D. D.] 8vo, pp. xvi, 558. New York: Phillips & Hunt. Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe. 1888. \$3.50.

We take pleasure in strongly commending this volume to all who desire accurate information on its important theme. The author has devoted many years of patient investigation to its production. He has studied the monuments of Christian antiquity by personal examination. Dr. Piper, the well-known Head of the Christian Museum in the University of Berlin, has been familiar with the author's studies for a long time, and bears testimony to their method and value. The work embraces the topics common to books on Christian Antiquities. It is distinguished from its predecessors by its use of new material in the discussion of familiar subjects, and more especially by its wide range of information in a department heretofore very meagrely treated, not only in Archæologies, but in church histories, the department of Christian Art. The "Dictionary of Christian Antiquities" (1875, 1880) and recent works on the Roman Catacombs have done much to supply the need at this point previously felt, but there was still a demand for a compact and systematic presentation of the results of modern investigation, which has now been met by this able and scholarly work. Its special claim to distinction lies in the field just indicated. The author has mastered the later discussions respecting early Christian art, its symbolism, frescos, mosaics, carvings, sculpture, architecture, inscriptions; he knows not only the literature of the subject, but the monuments themselves; and he writes with a definiteness, precision, and authority otherwise unattainable. In no portion of ancient history are sobriety and penetration more necessary, as well as patient attention to many diverse details. No one who has not given much personal consideration to the subject can appreciate its difficulties. We are confident that those best informed will most highly appreciate the good judgment, as well as industry, enterprise, and command of resources, exhibited by Dr. Bennett in this work.

After an Introduction, setting forth the nature, scope, and utility of his science, Professor Bennett distributes his materials into four main divisions. The first book treats of the "Archæology of Christian Art," and fills nearly three hundred pages of the volume. Most of the topics here considered are entirely unnoticed in Dr. Coleman's useful work (1843). The difference shows the progress in such studies within a generation. The other divisions are more familiar—the Constitution and Government of the Church; Sacraments and Worship; Christian Life. The special value of Dr. Bennett's handling of these subjects lies in his use of what has been gained from the study of Christian art.

It is impossible, within the limits of this notice, to do much more than

call attention to this superior manual, and indicate, as we have endeavored to do, its special character in relation to other works in the same department. From the nature of the subject the topics are very numerous, and almost everything of importance of which it treats has been keenly debated. Dr. Bennett shows his trustworthiness as a teacher and guide by his reservations of judgment as well as by its clear expression.

One or two suggestions we venture to offer with reference to a further development of its theme in a new edition or otherwise. The definition of Archæology is fundamental. What is the distinction between Archæology and History? It cannot be drawn topically. The Archæologist deals with the same sources of information as the historian. Dr. Bennett very properly treats of three out of four of the subjects under which Neander in his Church History classifies his materials — the Constitution, Worship, and Life of the Ancient Church. The difference between the two sciences must be found in the point of view. The historian considers all events as in motion, as in a causal series; the archæologist regards them as fixed. His work is with the monuments of a particular age, with whatever won a definite form in the form thus won. Why should a "Christian Archæology" have sections on the Polity, Worship, and Life of the Church and not on its Teaching and Doctrine? Fixed forms appear here as elsewhere. The subject of the catechumenate is touched upon in the work before us, but too meagrely. We have noticed no allusion to the *Disciplina Arcani*, and scarcely anything respecting doctrinal symbols. The Constitution of the Church is ably and freshly discussed, with reference to the latest investigations. Ought there not to be an account of the diocesan and other divisions from the time of the Peace of the Church? Indeed, highly as we prize this book in its present form, and because we thus prize it, we wish that it might lead the author to something further. As it stands we have a most needed and instructive account of the Archæology of Christian Art, to which is added a valuable statement of the Archæology of Church Polity, Worship and Life. This, however, does not give a complete or harmonious plan. There are three main divisions of Archæology, as of Church History — Life, Doctrine, Organization. The Archæology of Art stands related to each. It gives information as to the doctrines, the spirit, the institutions of the Church. If this is correct it will be seen that Dr. Bennett's first book is not coördinate in subject with the other three. His most thorough work is expended upon the Archæology of Art and the use of the materials thus supplied. In the other books the work is, in other directions, less complete. This method does not give a rounded and symmetrical book on Christian Archæology, although it does give an admirable special treatise on the Archæology of Art, and a great deal of valuable material and discussion respecting the Antiquities of Church Polity, etc. We could wish that our author, who has shown so much ability for this department, would prepare a yet more complete volume on Christian Archæology after a more symmetrical and comprehensive plan — treating of all the fixed forms of Christian teaching, life, and organization in the Ancient Church, distributing the materials under these great rubrics, and subdividing so as to cover all the subjects of Christian Antiquities, not of course in the manner of a "Dictionary" but of scientific discussion and statement, and appropriating to each topic whatever information comes from works of art. The first book of the four in the present volume could then stand by itself as a work on the Archæology of Christian Art,

and also be incorporated in such way as its contents require into a general Archeology which would expand the remaining three books and add one on Doctrine; or better still, as we think, reduce the whole to the three divisions we have named. If, then, the distinction between history and archæology were consistently and rigorously applied, discussions of the anterior causes or later outcome of what assumed fixed forms would be excluded, save as necessary to the determination or immediate interpretation of these forms, and so the work be kept distinct from the excellent histories we now have which cover the same field in time and materials.

We trust these remarks will be understood in their sole intent — not as criticism of what has been done, for which we are only grateful, but as suggestions for something further. Meanwhile the present work will remain the most helpful general guide to the student of Christian antiquities which has appeared.

One or two minor points may be noticed for a new edition. Is there sufficient authority for the statement that Ambrose was of heathen parentage (p. 291)? Should not the "Candle Hymn of the Greek Christians" be recognized as possibly of very early origin? The argumentative force of the singular, *ἐκκλησία*, Acts ix. 31, is weakened by Paul's use of the plural, Gal. i. 22, 1 Thess. ii. 14. The claim that in the shorter Greek recension "the will of the bishop has unconditional validity" (p. 346, n.) goes too far, we think, and is inconsistent with the statement in the text (p. 345) that his ordinances depend for their validity on their agreement with the divine will. Nor does Ignatius have the idea of the episcopate as the organ of church unity — meaning by this the unity of the church universal. Christ is to him the Head of the Catholic Church. It is, however, natural and easy to pass over from Ignatius's thought to the later conception, and perhaps no more than this is meant. In the section on Byzantine architecture we think that more use might be made of De Vogüé's plates. Dr. Bennett leaves the wonderful church of St. Sophia almost unmediated in history. Remarkable as was the genius of its builders, it had, we must believe, more of an historical genesis than he recognizes, although this at present can only be imperfectly shown. Still we seem to be on the way to it as the problem develops of adjusting a dome to a polygonal base, and De Vogüé's plates (6: 4, 5, 1, 3; 15: 16; 133; 22) deserve attention in this regard.

The work is supplied with maps, plates, and numerous illustrations, which are of very great value. It is sold, moreover, at a remarkably low price considering its necessary cost and the vast amount of skillful work which has been expended on it.

Egbert C. Smyth.

DIE CHRISTLICHE GLAUBENSLEHRE VOM STANDPUNKT DES METHODISMUS. Von A. HÜLSTER, Ph. D., evang. Prediger zu Barrington, Ills., früher Professor der systematischen Theologie am Biblischen Institut zu Naperville, Ills., Verfasser einer Seelenlehre, etc. Pp. xvi, 577. Cincinnati: Gedruckt bei Cranston & Stowe. 1888. \$2.50.

This is a praiseworthy and useful attempt to give a systematic statement and vindication of the articles of the Christian faith as these are appropriated in the fellowship of the Methodist Church. The arrangement of topics is natural and clear; the style concise without obscurity; the tone of discussion dignified and appropriate; the reasoning direct

and forcible; in short, the author has supplied an admirable manual of Christian doctrine, which deserves to be reproduced in English, and is capable of valuable service to members of all denominations of Christians.

In a compact and instructive Introduction the author defines the position of Christian theology among the other theological sciences, and then gives an account of the nature and growth of that Christian faith which contains within itself the truths that dogmatics develops and maintains.

Christian doctrine, in the author's view, is the outcome of a particular or determinate form of thought and life. It presupposes faith, which is not only Christian, but Christian in a particular way. Calvinists, Lutherans, Methodists, are all Christian believers, but each denomination has its own special mode of apprehending Christianity, its own standards of faith and methods of life. The theologian, according to our author's conception, is not only a Christian, but a Christian imbued with the spirit of some special body of believers, in which Christian doctrine has taken on a particular form. This does not imply narrowness. In order to understand his own system he must know all others, discern its relation to past types, discriminate it from other existing methods and constructions, see it in its true historical perspective. Dogmatics must depend upon and be controlled by divine revelation. Though the Church existed before the canon of Sacred Scripture, yet it is not prior to the divine Word. "What we are to believe respecting God and divine things must rest on revelation of the divine, not on inventions of the fancy or reason." Holy Scripture "is and remains the norm by which all doctrines are to be tried." Hence the fundamental importance of exegetical science and Biblical theology. The theologian, however, is not a mere collector of proof-texts. The author criticises the method of "Lee's Theology," "Watson's Theological Institutes," and other works of Methodist divinity, which endeavor to substantiate every dogmatic proposition by Biblical citations, pointing out that this is contrary to the spirit of the Methodist Church, which has always laid the greatest emphasis on Christian experience. He notices, also, how Dr. Hodge's theological genius carries him quite beyond the bounds of the proof-text method, and into a happy inconsistency with his own rubric. The theologian is a reproducer of Christian truth. He writes from his own consciousness of its power and validity; and his personal apprehension of it is conditioned by his position and generation. The question of the place of apologetics in the scheme of theological sciences the author decides to be posterior to dogmatics, not its basis. The contents of a system of divinity are already given in Christian faith. Dogmatics is to teach "what the Christian, as a member of a definite Confession, believes, although disencumbered of all unbeliefs and *extra-beliefs* (Un- und Aberglauben)." "A partaker of the Spirit of God, he not only knows what is given to him of God (1 Cor. ii. 12), but also knows through the Holy Spirit God himself, whom he feels constrained to call his Father (1 Cor. ii. 11; Rom. viii. 16). The baptism of the spirit is an anointing to the knowledge of all mysteries of faith, and the communion of love and life with God opens naturally into the knowledge of God himself and of his love (1 John ii. 20; iv. 16). Originally and immediately certain of the truth of his faith, the Christian needs no preliminary mediation for it. An apologetics, as a basis and presupposition of a dogmatics, is thoroughly superfluous." The constant preparation required of the believer to give a

reason (*ἀπολογία*) for the hope that is in him (1 Pet. iii. 15), our author says, is to be found, first, in a consciousness formed by Christian experience; but so far as it is scientifically mediated it is to be found in dogmatics. "Therefore apologetics is not at the head of dogmatics. The natural position is just the reverse. I must first know and possess a good, before I can protect and defend it. . . . Apologetics is the scientific self-justification of Christianity; of Christianity in its essential kernel, apart from the dogmatic form which dogmatics has given it. It will exhibit Christianity as the correlative to the higher essential needs of men." It follows, rather than precedes, the statement of the fundamental truths of faith.

In the same way ethics is postponed. "However intimately connected are faith and life, what is to be believed is to be handled from another point of view than the manner and way in which faith shall show its activity in the life. Dogmatics accordingly has to do with God and his acts in the world, as well as with the operation of these upon and within men; ethics, on the contrary, has to designate the self-activity of men, proceeding from such divine working, as this develops in the manifold relations of daily life." The author disclaims any identification of his conception of dogmatics with Schleiermacher's. He emphasizes and makes supreme objective revelation and knowledge. But he insists that there can be actual experience only through the true union of the objective and subjective. "The Christian consciousness is a constitutive factor of the Christian personality, and does not allow itself to be ordered into silence when this personality engages in a work which demands the exercise of its highest power of expression."

Having thus sharply and discriminately defined his conception of the function of his dogmatics, the author proceeds to point out the distinctive character of Christian faith. Christianity is the absolute religion. It claims to satisfy the universal religious needs of men, and to fulfill the idea of religion. The distinctive characteristic of Christianity appears, not in any single doctrine, but in the Person and redeeming work of Christ. The whole circle of truth is to be viewed from Him as the Centre—the doctrines of God, of sin, of man, all take their Christian stamp and character through the revelation given in Him. But it is not enough for the theologian to know of this redemption and Redeemer outwardly. He must have something more than a *fides historica*. The necessity of the *fides divina* is forcibly presented. From this point there follows a clear account of the relation of faith and knowledge, and of the impulse to scientific theology implied in faith.

In the arrangement of the materials we have four Parts: The Doctrine of God; of the World; of moral Evil; of Salvation. So far as we have been able to examine, the subordinate distribution of topics and the conduct of the argument are carried out with the same breadth of view, lucidity of method, and definiteness of discrimination which characterize the Introduction.

We wish that more such theologies could be written. No better method is available for the progress of scientific divinity than for each school to work out its own principles in a thoroughly discriminating and constructive way. Books written on this method, and with the simplicity and skill of the one before us, would be of great value to the churches. Men who have carefully and comprehensively thought out their own beliefs, and have come to understand them in their connection with the

religious communities of which they are members, and with the history of the church, are pretty sure not only to be stable Christians, but humble, charitable, and wise.

Egbert C. Smyth.

NOTES FROM ENGLAND.

DURING the past few months no event, nor series of events, has taken place which touches so nearly at once the political, social, and religious life of England as the School Board Elections. These elections occur triennially, and took place last November in London and in most (but not all) of the great cities of this country. The recent Royal Commission on elementary education, the majority of which reported in favor of extending further privileges to the schools of the religious denominations, gave additional interest to the recent elections, which might be taken as in some measure a verdict on the conclusions of the Royal Commission. The verdict of the elections, if such it be, was not however so significant as it would have been if the supporters of the so-called "voluntary" or denominational schools had not widely repudiated on the eve of the elections the most disputed proposal of the Royal Commission, that their schools should receive support from the local rates without submitting to the control of the public, whose money they were to receive. In spite of this, a comparison of the results of the late elections with those of three years ago shows a distinct gain for the Liberals, and a reaction against the clericals: in Birmingham, Sheffield, Leeds, Bradford, and Leicester, the anti-clericals won decided victories; in London and Manchester the clericals remain in power; but in London the minority of Liberals is more powerful and compact, and would have been numerically stronger, had they not put forward too many candidates in some divisions and too few in others. Sooner or later the education problem must come again before Parliament, and these elections show perhaps the movement of that public opinion outside the House of Commons, which affects powerfully the voting within.

Unfortunately, it is to be feared that our present educational system, admitted by all to need reform, cannot be touched without creating grave difficulties and stirring up religious animosities. The great measure passed by the late Mr. W. E. Forster, in 1870, was statesmanlike in effecting a compromise to which both parties could agree, for a time, but it was not a piece of that heroic legislation which settles a question once and for all. At present the position is just this: the State entrusts its public elementary education to two sets of bodies, the school boards, which are popularly elected bodies governing the public undenominational board schools, and the churches, in whose schools the children may be taught the catechisms and doctrines of the peculiar church or sect to which the school belongs. Schools under the school boards are supported by Imperial grants and local rates, the schools under church or private management by the public grants and private subscriptions, while both alike receive the fees paid by the children. It is clear, then, that if, for instance, the popular demand for free education, that is, abolition of fees, is granted, the board schools, in which the fees are generally lower and

which are supported by local as well as Imperial taxation, will suffer much less than the church schools, which rely so largely on their fees and cannot rely on the local rates; free education, whenever granted, — and it soon must come, — will be bitterly opposed by the clericals. Then, again, the outcry against religious intolerance is sure to grow in force as long as the Church of England continues to become more and more a sacerdotal and “Catholic” communion. For in many, especially in the rural districts, where there is no school board and education is consequently entirely in the hands of the clergy, the children of Nonconformists have to go to the church school, where, in spite of the almost obsolete conscience clause, they may be taught such doctrine as that of the following: —

Question. In what light ought we to consider Dissenters?

Answer. As Heretics.

Q. Is their worship a laudable service?

A. No; their worship is idolatrous.

Q. Is dissent a great sin?

A. Yes; it is direct opposition to our duty to God.

Q. Why have not Dissenters been excommunicated?

A. Because the law of the land does not allow the wholesome law of the church to be acted on.

These questions, which unfortunately reflect only too well the light in which Nonconformist Protestants are regarded by the dominant party of the Church of England, are taken from a catechism very largely used in the church schools, and go far to explain the hostility of many to the government grant being given on equal terms to the board schools and to those schools which teach their own peculiar religious tenets. There will always be those who, in touching the burning question on what principle the grants of money are to be apportioned among the schools, will take the opportunity of protesting against strictly denominational schools being on the same footing as the public board schools, which cannot be carried on in the interests of any doctrinal views or party.

As the year closes, one asks, what has it produced? In the field of literature few books of the greatest value seem to have appeared, perhaps only one, which will rank as a great classic. It is, of course, premature to pass judgment; but Professor James Bryce's great work on “The American Commonwealth” has already been hailed as “the book of the year.” Worthy to stand beside the “Democracy in America” of De Tocqueville, it is being eagerly read in Britain, and doubtless will be more read in America. The author unites in a remarkable degree the qualities of lawyer, philosopher, statesman, and historian; he is a great traveler, and has a thorough knowledge of men as well as of books, of pressing problems as well as of constitutions. Professor Bryce was a fellow-student at Oxford, where his academical career was exceptionally brilliant, with the late Thomas Hill Green, and they became fast friends and ultimately colleagues on the professorial staff of the University.

This autumn saw the publication of the last volume of Professor Green's collected works. The volume contains a memoir, which is deeply interesting, not only to the general public as giving an authentic account of the original of the character of Mr. Gray in the now famous novel “Robert Elsmere,” but also to philosophers, since this life shows how in Professor Green the high thinking of the transcendentalist was blended

with the ardor of the practical philanthropist and made him a philosopher-politician.

The last month has witnessed the conclusion of that *magnum opus*, the "Encyclopædia Britannica," a work of which we may well be proud. No small share of the value of the work as a whole is due to the excellent tact of the editors, who have got just the right men to treat of the various subjects, and have apportioned the length of the articles, etc., most admirably.

England is generally regarded as one of the most Protestant of countries, but it is impossible to forget the great power and importance of the small Roman Catholic minority. It has frequently been noticed that in proportion to their numbers in the country they are represented more strongly than they should be in the House of Lords and more strongly than some of the Nonconformist bodies in the House of Commons. The secessions from the Church of England into the Church of Rome have been numerous for years; indeed, ever since the day when John Henry Newman quitted at once Oxford and the Anglican Church. But lately there have been certain secessions from the Church of Rome, not numerically great, but chiefly of priests who have become distinguished in the Roman Church. Perhaps the most notable of these is Mr. Addis, whose theological learning and literary acquirements were in great request with the Catholics, and who wrote also in the "Spectator" newspaper; it was he also who dissuaded Mr. Hutton, the well-known essayist and editor of the "Spectator," from joining the Roman Catholic Church. Mr. Addis has taken up ministerial work as a Free Christian (or Unitarian) pastor in one of our Australian colonies.

Theories concerning the Revelation of John seem never to fail. The latest is a very plausible theory, modestly put forward by Mr. J. Theodore Bent in the "Nineteenth Century" for December (No. 142, pp. 813 ff.). Mr. Bent, who has frequently visited Patmos and read there the Apocalypse "for purposes of local color," thinks that some of the imagery contained in it was suggested to the Apostle when he witnessed the eruption of Thera, which took place in, or just after, the year 60 A. D., the year most probably assigned as the date of the Apocalypse. Mr. Bent declares that he has himself stood on the sea-shore of Patmos and seen the Island of Thera (= the beast) rise from the sea far to the Southwest, and he there felt first the full force of the words, "I stood upon the sand of the sea and I saw a beast rise up out of the sea" (Rev. xiii. 1). Starting from this passage (which however would not have suggested the theory he espouses had he read it in the best Greek texts or in the Revised Version), Mr. Bent finds many other passages in the book of Revelation, which show that the author gathered his imagery from beholding the phenomena of a great volcanic eruption. These passages he discovers chiefly in the eighth and sixteenth chapters and entirely in chapters vi.-xvii. For instance, the great star "wormwood" was suggested by a great volcano bomb (Rev. viii. 10, 11), and the angel gathering the vintage of the earth (Rev. xiv. 19) by the inevitable destruction of the vines of Thera, of which the author must have been informed.

Interesting as this theory is, it can hardly claim to be established and needs that the imagery and symbolism of the Johannine apocalypse

should be compared with the imagery of Daniel and the other Jewish apocalyptic writings before any valid result can be expected.

The question of the origin and significance of the symbols and images of the Apocalyptic writings as a whole is a difficult theme, which has never been adequately treated by any recognized scholar. Mr. W. G. Collingwood published two years ago a little book "Astrology in the Apocalypse" (Allen, Orpington, 1886), in which he suggested that the beasts in the books of Daniel and Revelation were derived from the constellation-signs of the Chaldees, and that the jewels of the High Priest's breastplate and in the walls of the heavenly city (Rev. xxi. 19 f.) were the jewels of the Chaldean zodiac. This book attracted little or no attention from theologians, and its theory has neither been seriously refuted nor satisfactorily confirmed. Possibly some one of our rising young Orientalists, who is also a critical theologian, may take up the question!

Joseph King, Jr.

HAMPSTEAD, LONDON.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

Congregational Sunday-School & Publishing Society, Boston and Chicago. Sermons on the International Sunday-School Lessons for 1889. By the Monday Club. Fourteenth Series. Pp. 402. \$1.25.

Houghton, Mifflin & Co., Boston and New York. The Soul of the Far East. By Percival Lowell, Member of the Asiatic Society of Japan, author of "Choson," "A Korean Coup D'Etat." Pp. 226. 1888. \$1.25.

Massachusetts New-Church Union, Boston. Correspondences of the Bible. Part II. The Plants, The Miracles, and their Atmospheres. By John Worcester. Pp. vi, 330. 1888. \$1.00.

Roberts Brothers, Boston. Sunday-School Stories on The Golden Texts of the International Lessons of 1889. By Edward E. Hale, author of "In His Name," "Ten Times One," "Mrs. Merriam's Scholars," "The Man without a Country," etc., etc. Pp. x, 314. 1889. \$1.00.

Silver, Burdett & Co., Boston. Through Death to Life. Discourses on St. Paul's Great Resurrection Chapter. By Reuben Thomas, D. D., Harvard Church, Brookline, author of "Divine Sovereignty," "Grafenburg People," etc. Pp. 163. 12mo, cloth, gilt. 1888. \$1.25.

The Century Company, New York. Laudes Domini. A Selection of Spiritual Songs, ancient and modern, for the Sunday-School. Edited by Charles Seymour Robinson. Pp. 255. Sample copies, 35 cents.

Funk & Wagnalls, New York. Future Probation Examined. By William De Loss Love, South Hadley, Mass. Pp. x, 322. \$1.50.

G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York. The Life and Letters of Samuel Wells Williams, LL. D., Missionary, Diplomatist, Sinologue. By his Son, Frederick Wells Williams. Pp. 490. 1889. \$3.00.

Anson D. F. Randolph & Co., New York. Epochs of Church History. Edited by Professor Mandell Creighton. The English Church in the Middle Ages. By William Hunt. Pp. vii, 224. 80 cents; — A History of the University of Cambridge. By J. Bass Mullinger, M. A., Lecturer in History at St. John's College. Pp. xvi, 232. 80 cents; — The Popes and the Hohenstauffen. By Ugo Balzani. Pp. viii, 261. 80 cents; — The Thumb Bible. By John Taylor. 50 cents.

Thomas Whittaker, New York. The Law of Liberty, and other Discourses. By James Morris Whiton, Ph. D. Pp. viii, 255. 1889. \$1.25.

Scribner & Welford, New York. A New Commentary on Genesis. By Franz Delitzsch, D. D., Leipzig. Translated by Sophia Taylor. Vol. I. Pp. 412. 1889; — Manual of Biblical Archaeology. By Carl Friedrich Keil, Doctor and Professor of Theology. With alterations and additions furnished by the author for the English translation. Vol. II. Translated from the German and edited by the Rev. Alex. Cusin, M. A., Edinburgh. Pp. xii, 404. 1888.

N. Murray, Baltimore. The Fragments of the Work of Heraclitus of Ephesus on Nature. Translated from the Greek Text of Bywater, with an Introduction Historical and Critical. By G. T. W. Patrick, Ph. D., Professor of Philosophy in the State University of Iowa. 8vo, pp. x, 131. 1889.

Government Printing Office, Washington. U. S. Bureau of Education. Circular of Information, No. 1, 1888. Contributions to American Educational History. Edited by Herbert B. Adams. No. 2. Thomas Jefferson and the University of Virginia. By Herbert B. Adams, Ph. D., Associate Professor of History in the Johns Hopkins University. With Authorized Sketches of Hampden-Sidney, Randolph-Macon, Emory-Henry, Roanoke, and Richmond Colleges, Washington and Lee University, and Virginia Military Institute. Pp. 308. 1888; — Circular of Information No. 5, 1888. Industrial Education in the South. By Rev. A. D. Mayo. Pp. 86. 1888.

T. Fisher Unwin, London, England. The Ethics of Free Thought. A Selection of Essays and Lectures. By Karl Pearson, M. A., formerly Fellow of King's College, Cambridge. Pp. 446. 1888; — Inspiration and the Bible. An Inquiry. By Robert F. Horton, M. A., late Fellow of New College, Oxford. Second Edition. Pp. xiv, 256. 1888; — The German Emperor and Empress, Frederick III. and Victoria. The Story of their Lives. By Dorothea Roberts. Sixth and Popular Edition. Pp. xiii, 265. 1888; — The Lives of Robert and Mary Moffat. By their Son, John S. Moffat. Popular Edition. Portrait and Illustrations. Pp. xii, 314. 1889; — The House and its Builder, with other Discourses. A Book for the Doubtful. By Samuel Cox, D. D., author of a "Commentary on Job," "Balaam," "Ruth," "Salvator Mundi," etc., etc. Pp. 195. 1889.

